Using the law to protect against hate crimes
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Hate crimes occur, to a varying extent, in all countries. However, states’ approaches in tackling hate crimes differ widely, both from state to state and across continents. Some states have legislation to protect against hate crimes, while others do not. Where legislation is in place, it may be thorough and effective, or inadequate; similarly its use may be inconsistent. This chapter aims to establish the extent to which legislation can and should provide an effective framework to protect against and respond to hate crime, drawing on some specific examples, as well as relevant international legal standards and jurisprudence.

What is a hate crime?
Hate crimes can be broadly defined as criminal acts motivated by intolerance towards a certain group in society. Hate crimes therefore comprise two elements:

i. First, a *criminal offence* must have taken place. In other words, an act must have been committed that constitutes an offence under ordinary criminal law. Criminal law varies from state to state, and not all states criminalize exactly the same kind of conduct. However, in general, there are certain violent acts which most states can be said to criminalize. Further, a hate crime is not one particular offence. It could be an act of intimidation, threats, property damage, assault, murder or any other criminal offence. The term 'hate crime' therefore describes a type of crime, rather than a specific offence within a penal code.

ii. The crime must have been committed with a *bias motive*. It is this element which differentiates hate crimes from ordinary crimes. The perpetrator of the crime will have intentionally chosen the target of the crime (whether an individual or a group, or even property associated with a group) because of a characteristic shared with others, for example, national or ethnic origin, religion or descent.

Why should the law protect against hate crimes?
Hate crimes, by their very definition, are aimed at intimidating the victim and his or her community on the basis of their personal characteristics or presumed community. They send a clear message to both the victim and those sharing the characteristics that they are being targeted. These effects can be multiplied where a community has historically been a victim of discrimination. It will come as no surprise, therefore, that it is the most marginalized communities, including minorities and indigenous peoples, who are disproportionately affected as victims of hate crimes. Therefore there is a particularly strong symbolic value to adopting and enforcing clear, robust legal standards on hate crimes.

Further, if hate crimes are treated like other crimes and are not recognized as a special category by the law, the response may not be adequate. As established in European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) case law, when investigating violent incidents state authorities have the additional duty to take all reasonable steps to unmask any racist motive and to establish whether or not ethnic hatred or prejudice may have played a role in the events. Those investigating a crime may fail to address allegations of bias motive, or judges may not hand down a sentence which reflects the severity of the crime. During the investigation of a hate crime, the victim may be accused of being at fault. Further, if hate crimes are not appropriately investigated or prosecuted and sufficient punishments handed down, this can send a clear message to other potential or actual victims that institutionalized discrimination will not change. All of this will in turn deter other hate crime victims from reporting similar offences. This further underlines the need for ‘proportionate and dissuasive penalties’ for such offences.

International and regional legal standards on hate crimes
First, hate crimes undermine and threaten the right to equality and non-discrimination, a fundamental principle of international human rights law which features in most human rights instruments and state constitutions. Although hate crimes conducted by private individuals do not violate human rights standards by themselves, they are ‘particularly destructive’ of fundamental human rights and demand a response from the authorities which, if not forthcoming, results
in a human rights violation. As a result, states should take steps to prevent, eliminate, prohibit, investigate and punish all acts and manifestations of discrimination and intolerance, including hate crimes.

The right to equality and non-discrimination is set out in the very first line of the UN Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR) and refers to the ‘recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family’, while Article 2 of the UDHR states: ‘Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.’ The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights all require states to refrain from racial discrimination (including discrimination based on ethnicity or national origin) and to provide their residents with equal protection of all laws. In addition, Article 4 of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief requires states to ‘prevent and eliminate discrimination on the grounds of religions’ and to ‘take all appropriate measures to combat intolerance on the grounds of religion’.

Regional human rights instruments also afford protection against discrimination. The American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (the American Declaration) states: ‘All persons are equal before the law and have the rights and duties established in this Declaration, without distinction as to race, sex, language, creed or any other factor’; the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights (African Charter) provides for the rights to non-discrimination and equality under Articles 2 and 3; while Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR) protects against non-discrimination in relation to other ECHR rights, and Protocol 12 provides a stand-alone right to non-discrimination.

Other rights which hate crimes may violate include the right to be free from torture or inhuman treatment, and the right to privacy. All of these rights and fundamental freedoms are enshrined in the UN international instruments including the UDHR and the ICCPR, as well as within the regional conventions such as the ECHR, African Charter and American Declaration. Further, the recently adopted Inter-American Convention against All Forms of Discrimination and Intolerance and Convention against Racism, Racial Discrimination, and Related Forms of Intolerance both refer to the ‘surge in hate crimes motivated by gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and other social conditions’, specifically reaffirm the principles of equality and non-discrimination, and oblige states to prevent, eliminate, prohibit and punish all acts and manifestations of discrimination and intolerance, including hate crimes.

In addition to the protection afforded by these legal instruments, some go further and specifically call on states to criminalize certain acts and/or require states to adopt appropriate legislation to punish bias-motivated crimes. For example, Article 4 of CERD imposes an obligation on states to take ‘immediate and positive measures’; while paragraph (a) requires that it should be an offence to ‘disseminate ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, incitement to racial discrimination, as well as all acts of violence or incitement to such acts against any race or group of persons of another colour or ethnic origin’.

The European Commission on Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) has also called for the criminalization of such acts in its General Policy Recommendations. Meanwhile, the EU’s Framework Decision on Combating Racism and Xenophobia recognizes the differences across the EU in laws dealing with racist and xenophobic behaviour, and different approaches to prohibitions on speech. It aims to establish a common criminal law approach, punishable in the same way in all the member states, and instructs them to take the necessary measures to ensure that racist and xenophobic motivation is considered an aggravating circumstance, or alternatively that such motivation may be taken into consideration by the courts in the determination of the penalties.
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National legislation tackling hate crimes

The adoption of national criminal law to protect against hate crimes sends a clear signal to potential victims, perpetrators and society that hate crimes are not acceptable. The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has identified a number of factors which should feature in effective national legislation and which can be used as a guideline for drafting and analyzing such legislation.11

Viewed from a minority rights perspective, these should include the following:

- Hate crime laws should include characteristics that are fundamental to a person’s identity, such as religion, ethnicity or national origin, and these characteristics should be visible or readily known to the offender;
- Hate crime laws should protect victims who are associated or affiliated with persons or groups having protected characteristics;
- Further, hate crime laws should include offences where the offender was mistaken about the victim’s identity;
- Hate crime laws should recognize social and historical patterns of discrimination;
- Sentences for hate crimes should be more severe than sentences for the same offences committed in their ordinary forms, to ensure just and fair redress and also have a dissuasive effect;
- Courts should be required to consider evidence of motivation, however they should not require a specific emotional state, such as ‘hate’ or ‘hostility’;
- Hate crime laws should recognize that offenders sometimes act with multiple motives; and
- Hate crime legislation should recognize that either people or property can be victims.

Since these criteria are only a regional guideline, the extent to which domestic legislation meets them varies throughout the world, as will be seen by the following examples.

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH)

Bosnian society is still recovering from violent conflict and therefore hate crimes are hugely detrimental to rebuilding social trust. The targets of hate crimes will not only be Bosniaks, Croats...
and Serbs, but also minority and vulnerable groups, such as Roma and Jews. It is therefore a welcome development that BiH has become one of the many European states that has enacted legal provisions specifically to deal with bias-motivated crimes and incidents. BiH’s complex constitutional framework means that these provisions are set out in legislation adopted at the state and entity levels.12 Recent amendments to this legislation have ensured that it provides a clear definition of hatred which does not rely on an emotional state but recognizes that the perpetrator believes the victim belongs to a certain group in society (even if mistaken); incorporates a broad list of protected characteristics; and provides for aggravated forms of criminal offence where committed with a bias motivation. It also prohibits incitement to national, racial or religious hatred. The legislation is largely seen as positive with regard to protection against and responses towards hate crimes, but extensive monitoring by the OSCE has shown that there is still a need for police, lawyers and courts to start using the legislation appropriately and therefore overcome the societal prejudice which impedes access to justice.

South Africa

Despite a robust and exemplary Bill of Rights, to date South Africa has not enacted any legislation which protects against hate crimes related to intolerance of or discrimination against people on the basis of their ethnicity, gender, religion, nationality, sexual orientation or other forms of identity. Hate crimes occur frequently in South Africa, and reports of assaults which aim to ‘correct’ sexual orientation through rape are rife. Following years of pressure from human rights groups and a global petition signed by 170,000 people from 175 countries on change.org, significant steps have now been taken to rectify this position, with the recent announcement of a Policy Framework on Combating Hate Crimes, Hate Speech and Unfair Discrimination. According to the government, this framework:

‘is a result of intense research into the development of legislation that will introduce the concept of hate crime to South African criminal law. It will make hate speech a crime and will provide for the development of measures to combat hate crimes, hate speech and unfair discrimination [and] seeks to introduce a further category of newly-defined hate crimes in instances where the conduct would otherwise constitute an offence and where there is evidence of a discriminatory motive on the basis of characteristics such as race, nationality, religion, sexual orientation and the like.’

At the time of writing, the Policy Framework will soon be presented to cabinet for approval, prior to a public consultation process. Given this, it is difficult to comment on the extent to which the eventually adopted legislation will meet the desired criteria set out above, and indeed the extent to which such legislation will be used in practice, given widespread societal attitudes (for instance towards sexual minorities), but the establishment of a policy is to be welcomed as an important move to recognize and protect the plight of the most marginalized.

India

Although India does not have specific hate crime legislation, it does have legislation which seeks to prevent ‘atrocities’ against its Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (essentially, India’s most disadvantaged communities, Dalits and Adivasis, as recognized by its Constitution). The Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 aims to curb and punish violence against Dalits and Adivasis. It lists a number of acts which would be considered atrocities, and therefore criminal acts, against those it seeks to protect, including acts which seek to cause injury, insult or humiliation, such as the forced consumption of noxious substances; systemic violence, for example through forced labour, denial of access to water or sexual abuse; and deprivation of property. The Act also creates Special Courts for the trial of such offences, and calls on states with high levels of caste violence to appoint qualified officers to monitor and maintain law and order. While such an attempt to address endemic discrimination against India’s most marginalized communities is laudable, unfortunately it has not yet achieved the desired effect. Very few states have created separate Special Courts in accordance with the law, and there is very little will to either register
or investigate alleged offences under the Act, partly due to lack of awareness and partly due to discriminatory attitudes. In addition, using the law within the courts is often degrading to these communities, because of systemic bias within the judiciary. Moreover, hate crimes take place in India against other communities, for example Muslims are particularly at risk of hate incidents, and no legislation exists to specifically address these issues. In addition, using the law within the courts is often degrading to these communities, because of systemic bias within the judiciary.

In its analysis of the merits, the Committee stated that:

‘[t]he issue before the Committee is whether the state party fulfilled its positive obligation to properly investigate and prosecute the assault suffered by the petitioners … having regard to its duty, under article 2 of the Convention, to take effective action against reported incidents of racial discrimination.’

The Committee considered that in the present case ‘enough elements warranted a thorough investigation by public authorities into the possible racist nature of the attack against the family’, that ‘the investigation into the events was incomplete’ and concluded that the state failed ‘to effectively protect the petitioners from an alleged act of racial discrimination, and to carry out an effective investigation, which consequently deprived the petitioners from their right to effective protection and remedies against the reported act of racial discrimination’.

Therefore, Article 6 and Article 2, paragraph 1 (d) of CERD were violated.

European Court of Human Rights
In a series of recent judgments, the ECtHR has held that states have positive obligations under the ECHR to investigate the potential racial motivation of crimes.

First, in the landmark decision of Nachova and Others v. Bulgaria, the ECtHR’s Grand Chamber considered the case of two Roma who had absconded from a military construction crew, and were shot and killed during an attempted arrest by a Major, and senior officer in charge, of the military police. After the shooting, the Major allegedly pointed a gun at a local resident and shouted ‘You damn gypsies.’ The Major claimed he had aimed at their feet in order not to cause a fatal injury. An autopsy showed one victim died of a chest wound, and was shot from the front, while the other was shot from behind. A preliminary investigation summarized that the Major had not committed any offence and the
matter should be closed. Finding a violation of the right to life, the right to an effective remedy, and the right to non-discrimination under the ECHR, the ECtHR held in particular that there was a duty to investigate possible racist motives behind acts of violence by state authorities, and that Bulgaria’s failure to do so constituted a violation of the right to life (the procedural aspect to investigate) taken in conjunction with the non-discrimination provision set out in Article 14 of the ECHR. This represented a significant step forward in its explicit recognition that hate crimes require a criminal justice response proportionate to the harm caused. However, the ECtHR failed to find a violation of the substantive element of the right to life – that is, the negative obligation on the state not to deprive you of your life – which is not surprising given that it is very difficult to prove as a matter of human rights law that police or military have committed a hate crime.

Two years later, the ECtHR reaffirmed and extended these principles to a different scenario involving non-state actors, in the case of Šečić v. Croatia. The applicant, a Croatian national of Roma ethnicity, was violently attacked by a group of individuals. He was hospitalized with multiple rib fractures and suffered long-term psychological damage. His attackers were known to belong to a skinhead group who would engage over the following years in numerous attacks against Roma. The applicant filed a criminal complaint immediately after the attack and, over the ensuing years, provided further evidence to the police as to the identity of his attackers. However, the efforts undertaken by the authorities to identify and punish the attackers were very limited, and in fact the investigation was still open at the time of the ECtHR’s judgment. Finding violations of the procedural aspect of the right to freedom from torture and inhuman or degrading treatment, in conjunction with the right to non-discrimination. However, it is worth noting that the Court rejected the applicant’s claim that the ineffective investigation was caused by the authorities’ racial bias because the applicant had not substantiated his allegations through evidence of tendentious remarks or racist insults. This reaffirms the Court’s finding in Nachova, that it is very difficult to prove as a matter of human rights law that the authorities were themselves guilty of discrimination in the context of a hate crime; it is much easier to prove that they failed in their positive obligations to investigate the hate motivation.

Inter-American jurisprudence
The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) has recently adopted a stance in its jurisprudence mirroring that of the ECtHR. In Wallace de Almeida v. Brazil, a case concerning an 18-year-old black man serving as a professional soldier in the Brazilian Army who was murdered on 13 September 1998 by members of the military police, the IACHR relied on ECtHR
case law – specifically the case of Nachova and Others v. Bulgaria – in its analysis of the presumed violation of the right to equality before the law (Article 24 of the American Convention on Human Rights). The IACHR relied upon the obligation for states, under Article 2 of the ECHR, ‘to conduct an effective investigation in cases where someone has been deprived of life’ in developing its own standards:

‘This obligation must be met without discrimination, as required under Article 14 of the Convention. When there are suspicions that racial attitudes led to a violent act, it is particularly important that an official investigation be conducted vigorously and impartially, considering the need to continuously reaffirm society’s condemnation of racism, and to retain minorities’ trust in the ability of the authorities to protect them from the threat of racial violence.’

The IACHR insisted on the ‘additional duty to take all reasonable steps to expose any racist motive and to establish whether any racial hatred or prejudice could have played a role in what happened’, but mitigated this statement declaring that:

‘[i]t is acknowledged that proving the existence of racist motives is extremely difficult in practice. The respondent state’s obligation to investigate any racist overtone in a violent act is an obligation to use its best efforts in a non-absolutist way.’

In the end, the IACHR found a violation of Article 24 of the American Convention, in relation to the failure to protect the life of an individual belonging to a group considered vulnerable (of African descent, poor, living in a favela) – that is, the substantive, negative obligation on the state not to deprive a person of his life – and not in relation to the lack of thorough and effective investigation. The case clearly sets important legal standards for the investigation of hate crimes in the future, in particular since it seems to go further than the ECtHR in Nachova.

The Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR) – a separate body from the IACHR, which can consider cases referred to it by the IACHR – has however been less progressive in the development of such rigorous standards of investigation. In Río Negro Massacres v. Guatemala, which concerned the early 1980s massacre of approximately 5,000 members of the Maya community of Rio Negro by Guatemalan military and paramilitaries, the IACtHR considered claims that:

‘the failure to comply with [the] increased obligation to investigate and prosecute the acts of genocide and racism perpetrated against the community of Río Negro perpetuates the effects of the racial discrimination to which the members of the Maya Achi people were subjected.’

Although the Court had the opportunity to analyze the relation between acts of violence and ethnic origin, it has not followed the approach adopted by the ECtHR and now the IACHR, which recognizes a specific obligation for states to investigate racial motivation in
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The IACtHR instead confined itself to recalling its traditional jurisprudence on the obligation for states to investigate allegations of human rights violations. Unfortunately, this attitude does not allow it to take into consideration the specificity of acts of violence directed towards a particular category of individuals because of their very characteristics, such as ethnic or national origin, religious belief or sexual orientation. Currently, the IACtHR only recognizes the specific importance of the obligation to investigate in cases of massive violations of human rights. For example, in the case of the Massacres of El Mozote and nearby places v. El Salvador, the IACtHR declared that:

‘the obligation to investigate, as a fundamental and conditioning element for the protection of certain violated rights, acquires a particular and determining importance and intensity in view of the severity of the crimes committed and the nature of the rights violated, as in cases of grave human rights violations that occur as part of a systematic pattern or practice applied or tolerated by the state or in contexts of massive, systematic or generalized attacks on any sector of the population, because the urgent need to prevent the repetition of such events depends, to a great extent, on avoiding their impunity and meeting the expectations of the victims and society as a whole to know the truth about what happened.’

Clearly this is an area of the IACtHR’s jurisprudence which would benefit from some further development, and the Court would do well to follow the approach of the IACHR, for example.

African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights

The African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights (ACHPR) has considered several incidents of hate crime in its jurisprudence and commented on state failure to adequately investigate such events, but has not yet established the same detailed standards as other regional and international mechanisms above. In Kevin Mgwanga Gumme et al. v. Cameroon, the ACHPR considered allegations that individuals in South Cameroon – who were seeking self-determination – had been killed by the police either during violent suppression of peaceful demonstrations or in detention, and had also been ill-treated. The ACHPR found that, as the government did not deny the alleged violations, and had the opportunity to enquire into the alleged violations but did not conduct an investigation and provide redress for the victims, it failed to protect the rights of the alleged victims in accordance with Article 4 of the African Charter (the right to life). Although the ACHPR recognized that discriminatory practices had occurred, it did not look into the racial motivation behind the crimes, nor did it establish any standards in relation to the level of investigation that should be conducted where there is evidence of hate crimes. The ACHPR’s approach to some extent reflects the lack of development of hate crime policies and legislation in Africa; as with the IACtHR, this area of the ACHPR’s jurisprudence would benefit from some development in order to set valuable legal standards.

Conclusion

As demonstrated throughout this chapter, states’ and therefore regional – approaches in tackling hate crimes differ widely. While some states have legislation in place which is effective and enforced, others do not. In addition, while European countries and regional structures appear to have the most progressive approach towards tackling hate crime, this is an unfortunate phenomenon that minorities and indigenous peoples face throughout the world – including of course in that region. Hate crime legislation is imperfect, but opportunities to improve it increase as it evolves. Legislation and, in turn, jurisprudence of regional and international bodies, can – and should – provide an effective framework to protect against and respond to hate crime, and minority and indigenous rights activists and practitioners would do well to develop it.
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