



Veronika Bajt, Ana Frank, Vlasta Jalušič, Maja Ladić

Odgovorno delovanje za vključujoče lokalne skupnosti (CIFER)

Nacionalno poročilo - **SLOVENIJA**



Building Responsible Action for Inclusive Local Communities (CIFER)

National report - **SLOVENIA**

Odgovorno delovanje za vključujoče lokalne skupnosti (CIFER), Nacionalno poročilo – Slovenija / Building Responsible Action for Inclusive Local Communities (CIFER), National report – Slovenia

Projekt / Project: Mesto za vsakogar – Odgovorno delovanje za vključujoče lokalne skupnosti (CIFER) / City for Everybody – Building Responsible Action for Inclusive Local Communities (CIFER)

Avtorice / Authors: Veronika Bajt, Ana Frank, Vlasta Jalušič, Maja Ladić

Oblikovanje / Design: Jasna Babić Zrimšek

2. November 2023 / November 2nd 2023

Kazalo

Pristop k raziskavi in struktura poročila	7
1. Uvod	7
Koliko migrantov?	8
2. Pravni in institucionalni okvir politik proti rasizmu in proti diskriminaciji	9
Enake pravice in prepoved diskriminacije	9
Glavne institucije odgovorne za zaščito pred rasizmom in diskriminacijo	10
Politike, strategije, pobude in primeri diskriminacije	10
Koliko je primerov diskriminacije?	12
Nekaj zaključkov	13
3. Lokalne prakse in izkušnje	14
Kakšni so problemi?	15
4. Potrebe, omejitve in priložnosti: Kaj bi bilo treba in kaj bi bilo mogoče storiti, da bi Ljubljana postala "Mesto za vsakogar"?	29
Protirasistična strategija in opolnomočenje migrantov	30
Jezik	31
Kampanje za osveščanje večinskega prebivalstva in strokovnjakov	32
Prostori za srečevanje različnih ljudi	33
Skupnostni projekti, ki vključujejo lokalno in migrantsko prebivalstvo	34
Država, zakonodaja, lokalne institucije in civilna družba morajo biti povezani	35
5. Zaključek	36
Viri	38

Table of Content

1. Introduction	42
Research approach and report structure	42
How many migrants?	43
2. Legal and institutional framework of anti-racist and anti-discrimination policies	44
Equal rights and non-discrimination	44
Main institutions responsible for protection against racism and discrimination	45
Policies, strategic documents, initiatives, and cases of discrimination	45
How many cases of discrimination?	47
Some conclusions	48
3. Local practices and experiences	49
What are the problems?	50
4. Needs, limitations, and opportunities: What should and could be done to make Ljubljana the “City for Everybody”?	65
Anti-racist strategy and empowering migrants	66
Language	67
Awareness-raising campaigns for the majority population and professionals	68
Spaces for different people to meet	69
Community projects including local and migrant population	70
State, legislation, local institutions, and grassroots must be connected	71
5. Conclusion	72
References	74

Odgovorno delovanje za vključujoče lokalne skupnosti (CIFER)

Nacionalno poročilo – Slovenija

Autorice:

Veronika Bajt, Ana Frank, Vlasta Jalušič, Maja Ladić

1. Uvod

To poročilo je prvi rezultat mednarodnega projekta Mesto za vsakogar – odgovorno delovanje za vključujoče lokalne skupnosti (CIFER). Njegov glavni cilj je nasloviti in bolje razumeti rasizem, ksenofobijo ter nestrpnost do ljudi z migrantskim ozadjem v izbranih mestih – Ljubljana, Zagreb, Budimpešta, Pariz in Malmö – ter razviti ideje in politike, ki bi prispevale k bolj vključujočemu okolju v teh mestih, da postanejo "mesta za vsakogar". CIFER si prizadeva zmanjšati tako strukturni kot institucionalni rasizem, obenem pa povečati osebno odgovornost in vlogo lokalnih uradnikov, zaposlenih v izobraževalnih ustanovah ter ponudnikov storitev, ter jih ozavestiti, da tudi oni lahko preprečijo diskriminacijo, prispevajo k bolj pravičnim politikam in enakopravni obravnavi najbolj ranljivih skupin znotraj migrantske populacije. Te iste ciljne skupine naj bi postale tudi bolj motivirane in aktivne pri razvijanju ter izvajanju protirasističnih in protidiskriminacijskih politik v mestu.

Namen tega nacionalnega poročila je ponuditi temeljno znanje za nadaljnje dejavnosti in celovite informacije o težavah na področju rasizma, ksenofobije in nestrpnosti v Ljubljani, glavnem mestu Slovenije. Poročilo, ki posebno pozornost namenja nacionalnemu kontekstu migracij in diskriminacije, je rezultat raziskave izvedene v okviru projekta CIFER v letu 2023.

Pristop k raziskavi in struktura poročila

Poleg preučevanja, kako se državne in mestne oblasti ter politike lotevajo rasizma, ksenofobije in diskriminacije, smo raziskali tudi osveščenost oseb z migrantskim ozadjem glede njihovih pravic, potreb in sposobnosti za obravnavanje rasizma, ksenofobije in diskriminacije, ki jih doživljajo ali bi jih lahko doživljali v Ljubljani. Analizirali smo nacionalno zakonodajo, mestne politike in poročila relevantnih javnih institucij (kot so Zagovornik načela enakosti, Varuh človekovih pravic in Vrhovno državno tožilstvo) ter pregledali obstoječe raziskave in nacionalne ter EU statistične podatke, ki so bili na voljo.

Poleg tega smo izvedli deset intervjujev z migranti, ki živijo v prestolnici, ter s predstavniki lokalne, izobraževalne in nevladne (NVO) skupnosti, ter izvedli štiri fokusne skupine s 30 udeleženci, ki predstavljajo omenjene štiri ciljne skupine projekta. Ker CIFER posveča posebno pozornost skupinam na presečiščih diskriminacije, smo se še posebej osredotočili na mlade muslimanske ženske, ženske, ki ne govorijo (dobro) slovensko ter mlade izobražene migrante v Ljubljani. Za rekrutiranje sogovornikov smo uporabili obstoječe mreže in kontakte, ki smo jih na Mirovnem inštitutu vzpostavili skozi leta raziskovalnega in zagovorniškega dela na področju človekovih pravic, protidiskriminacije, rasizma, ksenofobije, migracij, enakosti spolov itd. (Ladić et al. 2018; 2020; 2022; Bajt et al. 2018; MiCREATE 2019; Jalušič in Bajt 2020; 2021; Bajt 2021a).

V nadaljevanju predstavljamo splošen kontekst Slovenije in institucionalni okvir protirasističnih in protidiskriminacijskih politik, ter kontekst teh ukrepov v prestolnici Ljubljani. Nato sledi analiza terenskega dela s ciljnim skupinami (intervjuji in fokusne skupine) na nekaterih ključnih težavnih področjih vsakdanjega življenja in v institucijah, relevantnih za integracijo v Ljubljani. Nazadnje predstavljamo potrebe, ki smo jih razbrali v okviru naše raziskave, ter ideje in možnosti za izboljšanje življenja prebivalcev mesta (mesta za vsakogar).

Koliko migrantov?

Leta 2023 je v Sloveniji živel približno 200.000 tujih državljanov, kar predstavlja 9,1% celotnega prebivalstva. Ženske predstavljajo 51,1% slovenskih državljanov in 36,5% tujih državljanov v Sloveniji (SURs 2023). Največji delež tujcev še vedno predstavljajo državljani nekdanjih republik Jugoslavije, sledijo državljani drugih držav EU (EMVI 2022). Med tujimi državljani je približno 1000 oseb z odobreno mednarodno zaščito (UOIM 2023a), ki pretežno živijo v Ljubljani in okoliških krajih. V letu 2023 do septembra je bilo v Sloveniji 5346 prosilcev za azil (UOIM 2023b), vendar jih je večina zapustila državo že v nekaj dneh.

Prebivalstvo Ljubljane znaša približno 300.000 ljudi, leta 2022 pa so tuji državljani predstavljali 12,7% prebivalcev mesta (SURs 2021). Na žalost Mestna občina Ljubljana ne zbira podrobnejših podatkov o svojem prebivalstvu, zato ne vemo, kolikšen delež prebivalstva bi lahko opisali kot migrante ali osebe z migrantskim ozadjem. Mestna občina Ljubljana (2023) prav tako ne objavlja rednih posodobitev o svojem prebivalstvu na svoji spletni strani. Splošna osveščenost o rasizmu in ksenofobiji je še vedno nizka, lokalne oblasti pa ne kažejo interesa za izobraževanja o teh temah. Pomanjkanje tovrstnega znanja je opazno med splošnim prebivalstvom, vendar se zdi, da je to težava tudi med oblikovalci politik, zaposlenimi v javnih institucijah, upravnih enotah, mestni upravi in pri izvajalcih raznih storitev. Zato ni presenetljivo, da Mestna občina Ljubljana še nima posebnih politik ali strategij za boj proti rasizmu, ksenofobiji in rasni diskriminaciji.

2. Pravni in institucionalni okvir politik proti rasizmu in proti diskriminaciji

Enake pravice in prepoved diskriminacije

Ustava Republike Slovenije (1992) zagotavlja vsem "enake človekove pravice in temeljne svoboščine, ne glede na narodnost, raso, spol, jezik, vero, politično ali drugo prepričanje, gmotno stanje, rojstvo, izobrazbo, družbeni položaj, invalidnost ali katerokoli drugo osebno okoliščino". Seznam osebnih okoliščin je odprt. Ustava prav tako prepoveduje spodbujanje neenakosti in nestrpnosti. Slovenija je ratificirala vse glavne mednarodne instrumente človekovih pravic v zvezi z diskriminacijo. Zakonodaja o nediskriminaciji vključuje Zakon o varstvu pred diskriminacijo (ZVarD) iz leta 2016, Zakon o delovnih razmerjih iz leta 2013, Zakon o poklicni rehabilitaciji in zaposlovanju invalidov iz leta 2004, Zakon o enakih možnostih invalidov iz leta 2010 ter Zakon o verski svobodi iz leta 2007.

V skladu z ZVarD je diskriminacija prepovedana na vseh področjih življenja, vključno s področji, ki jih zahteva Direktiva o izvajanju načela enakega obravnavanja oseb ne glede na raso ali narodnost (2000/43/ES) in Direktiva o splošnih okvirih enakega obravnavanja pri zaposlovanju in delu (2000/78/ES): rasa ali etnično poreklo, vera ali prepričanje, spolna usmerjenost, starost in invalidnost. Nacionalna zakonodaja poleg tega prepoveduje diskriminacijo na podlagi spola, jezika, spolne identitete ali izraza, družbenega položaja, ekonomskega stanja in izobrazbe, ter je na splošno odprtega značaja (klavzula o "drugih osebnih lastnostih"). Tako ZVarD kot tudi Zakon o delovnih razmerjih prepovedujeta neposredno in posredno diskriminacijo, nadlegovanje, navodila, ki napeljujejo k diskriminaciji ter maščevanje na podlagi spola, rase in etničnega porekla, vere ali prepričanja, spolne usmerjenosti, starosti in invalidnosti. ZVarD dodatno prepoveduje diskriminacijo na podlagi združenja, diskriminacijo na podlagi domneve in hude oblike diskriminacije (Kogovšek Šalamon 2022: 7).

Poleg tega je diskriminacija prepovedana s Kazenskim zakonikom (KZ-1), ki opredeljuje različna kazniva dejanja v zvezi s kršitvami načela enakosti, pri čemer kriminalizira tudi vsakogar, ki preganja posameznika ali organizacijo zaradi zavzemanja za enake pravice (KZ-1 2008).¹ Leta 2023 je bil KZ-1 spremenjen z uvedbo zločina iz sovraštva kot obvezne oteževalne okoliščine, ki jo je treba upoštevati pri izreku kazni. To pomeni, da se pri vsakem kaznivem dejanju, pri katerem je bila motivacija osebna okoliščina žrtve, zahteva strožjo kazen za storilca. To velja za kazniva dejanja, storjena zaradi žrtvine narodnosti, rase, vere, etničnega porekla, spola, barve kože, izvora, premoženjskega statusa, izobrazbe, družbenega položaja, političnih ali drugih prepričanj, invalidnosti, spolne usmerjenosti ali katere koli druge osebne okoliščine.

¹ To kaznivo dejanje še ni bilo uspešno preganjano.

Slovenija je podpisnica Protokola št. 12 h Konvenciji o varstvu človekovih pravic in temeljnih svoboščin (2000). Podpisnice tega protokola se v prvem odstavku 1. člena zavezujejo, da je uživanje vseh pravic, ki jih določa zakon, zagotovljeno brez "diskriminacije na kateri koli podlagi, kot so spol, rasa, barva kože, jezik, vera, politično ali drugo prepričanje, narodnostni ali socialni izvor, povezava z narodnostno manjšino, lastnina, rojstvo ali drug status".

Glavne institucije za zaščito pred rasizmom in diskriminacijo

Zagovornik načela enakosti je bil ustanovljen z Zakonom o varstvu pred diskriminacijo (ZVarD). Gre za neodvisni državni organ za prepoznavanje diskriminacije, ki opravlja tudi naloge nadzora nad izvajanjem ZVarD. Zagovornik daje priporočila zakonodajalcu, pri čemer poudarja potrebo po jasnih definicijah, usklajeni politiki in od leta 2018 tudi zbira podatke o primerih diskriminacije ter ocenah diskriminatornih predpisov (Kogovšek Šalamon 2022: 6). Postopek se začne na podlagi pritožbe diskriminirane osebe, lahko pa se izvede tudi po uradni dolžnosti po anonimni prijavi ali prijavi tretje osebe o obstoju diskriminacije (glej FRA 2023).

Varuh človekovih pravic je še en organ, na katerega je mogoče nasloviti pritožbo v zvezi z diskriminacijo. Gre za neodvisno institucijo, zadolženo za varstvo in spodbujanje človekovih pravic, vključno s tistimi, povezanimi z nediskriminacijo in enakostjo. Pisarna varuha preiskuje pritožbe zaradi diskriminacije in daje priporočila javnim organom.

Ministrstvo za delo, družino, socialne zadeve in enake možnosti je odgovorno za razvoj politik in predpisov za boj proti diskriminaciji ter spodbujanje enakih možnosti na različnih področjih življenja. Sektor za enake možnosti je specializiran in odgovoren za spodbujanje enakosti spolov in boj proti diskriminaciji v Sloveniji. Ker se to poročilo osredotoča še posebej na ljudi z migrantskim ozadjem, je treba omeniti tudi Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve, ki koordinira pripravo dveh novih strategij – strategije o migracijah in strategije o integraciji migrantov, ki niso iz EU. Poleg tega je Urad Vlade za oskrbo in integracijo migrantov odgovoren za izvajanje politik, zasnovanih na področju integracije migrantov. V praksi pa se večinoma ukvarja z osebami z mednarodno zaščito in prosilci za azil.

Politike, strategije, pobude in primeri diskriminacije

V Sloveniji niso bili sprejeti nobeni strateški dokumenti o boju proti rasizmu, niti na nacionalni niti na lokalni ravni. 15. septembra 2022 je Zagovornik priporočil, da Vlada v skladu z smernicami EU sprejme štiri manjkajoče strategije na nacionalni ravni, saj so osnova za nadaljnje ukrepe za zaščito pred diskriminacijo in spodbujanje enakih možnosti: a) strategija za enakost spolov, b) akcijski načrt proti rasizmu, c) strategija za enakost LGBTIQ in d) strategija proti antisemitizmu (Zagovornik načela enakosti 2022c).

Ob koncu leta 2022 je vlada napovedala oblikovanje posebne medresorske delovne skupine za boj proti sovražnemu govoru in po besedah predsednika vlade naj bi bil boj proti sovražnemu govoru ena od prioritet v naslednjih šestih mesecih (Lebinger 2022). Dejansko je bil Strateški svet za preprečevanje sovražnega govora² aktiven med 17. marcem in 19. julijem, sestavljen pa je bil iz 19 članov, predstavnikov ministrstev, državnih institucij in nevladnih organizacij. Plod njihovega dela je bilo 57 priporočil vladi.

Septembra 2023 je Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve izdalo dva strateška dokumenta: osnutek Strategije Vlade RS na področju priseljevanja³ in osnutek Strategije vključevanja tujcev, ki niso državljani Evropske unije v kulturno, gospodarsko in družbeno življenje Republike Slovenije⁴. Druga strategija opredeljuje politiko integracije kot zajemanje "najširšega socialno-družbenega vključevanju tujcev v družbo": sistem izobraževanja od vrtca naprej, pomoč pri vključevanju na trgu dela, ukrepi na področju socialnega varstva, učenje o kulturnih značilnostih lokalnega okolja ter ukrepi za večje sprejemanje tujcev v lokalnem okolju. Več področij tega dokumenta ima pomanjkljivosti ali predstavlja osnovo za nadaljnjo diskriminacijo.⁵

Obstaja več primerov diskriminatornih določb v zakonih in postopkih, ki jih je odkril Zagovornik načela enakosti. Tu opisujemo nekatere, ki so najbolj pomembni za to poročilo in so bili razdelani v letnih poročilih Zagovornika in Varuha človekovih pravic. Zagovornik je ocenil, da 8.a člen Zakona o urejanju trga dela vodi do diskriminatornega obravnavanja določenih tujcev. Da bi ostali v registru brezposelnih oseb, na katerega je vezana upravičenost do socialne pomoči, morajo le tujci državljani tretjih držav v 12 mesecih opraviti izpit iz osnovnega znanja slovenščine (nivo A1). Ta pogoj ne velja za državljane EU, Norveške, Islandije, Liechtensteina in Švice. Ta razlika temelji izključno na osnovi državljanstva, za kar ni upravičenega razloga. V praksi takšna obravnava vpliva predvsem na državljane določenih tretjih držav (Zagovornik načela enakosti 2022a). Poleg tega je Zakon o visokem šolstvu diskriminatoren v delu, ki določa slovensko državljanstvo kot enega od pogojev za sprejem v subvencionirano študentsko bivanje. Zagovornik je priporočil, da Ministrstvo za visoko šolstvo pripravi spremembo Zakona o visokem šolstvu, tako da bodo vsi študenti s stalnim prebivališčem v Sloveniji, ne glede na njihovo državljanstvo, upravičeni do subvencioniranega bivanja (ibid.).

V letu 2022 so pri Zagovorniku vložile pobudo tri ženske, ki so trdile, da so bile diskriminirane pri delu v zdravstveni instituciji zaradi tega, ker nosijo naglavno ruto. V dveh primerih je Zagovornik predlagal, da delodajalec spremeni (diskriminatorno) prakso in ženskam omogoči njihovo delo z naglavno ruto. Delodajalec je predlog sprejel. V tretjem primeru je posameznica umaknila svojo pritožbo, kot rezultat pa

² Več informacij na: <https://www.gov.si/zbirke/delovna-telesa/strateski-svet-za-preprecevanje-sovraznega-govora/>

³ Dostopno na: https://img.rtvsl.si/files/2023/10/06/28_481629736695496724_strategija1.pdf

⁴ Dostopno na: https://img.rtvsl.si/files/2023/10/06/28_481629802277634068_strategija2.pdf

⁵ Konkretno na področju zaposlovanja so vsi ukrepi usmerjeni v zadovoljevanje potreb delodajalca, saj le-ti odločajo o tem, kdo, iz katerih držav in kako lahko vstopi v Slovenijo. Vzpostavitev INFO točke v okviru zavodov za zaposlovanje v Sloveniji in tujini v določenih ciljnih državah (tistih brez vizumske obveznosti za vstop v Slovenijo) predstavlja filtrirni mehanizem za selekcijo "ustreznih" migrantov že v državi izvora, pred vstopom v Slovenijo.

je Zagovornik postopek zaključil z odločitvijo o prekinitvi postopka (ibid.).

Prav tako leta 2022 je Varuh človekovih pravic izrazil skrb glede posameznih določb Zakona o tujcih (ZTuj) in Zakona o mednarodni zaščiti (ZMZ), obenem pa tudi poslal obvestilo posebnemu poročevalcu Združenih narodov za pravice migrantov.⁶ Zahteva po opravljanju izpita iz slovenščine na ravni A1 je bila uvedena v ZTuj kot pogoj za podaljšanje začasnega dovoljenja za prebivanje družinskih članov državljanov tretjih držav, kar je predvsem prizadelo družinske člane migrantov in oseb z mednarodno zaščito.⁷ Poleg tega je bila uvedena nova zahteva za pridobitev dovoljenja za stalno prebivanje, in sicer opravljanje izpita iz slovenščine na ravni A2 (Varuh človekovih pravic 2021: 18). Vendar pa je bil konec oktobra 2023 ZTuj ponovno spremenjen, za začasno dovoljenje za prebivanje je bil pogoj znanja jezika iz ravni A1 znižan na "preživetveno raven" slovenščine, medtem ko je pogoj za dovoljenje za stalno prebivanje ostal na ravni A2.⁸ Spremembe ZMZ leta 2021 so tudi zmanjšale standarde in pravice prosilcev za azil in oseb z mednarodno zaščito in skrajšale obdobje integracije s treh na dve leti, tako da je sistematična podpora pri integraciji zagotovljena le dve leti po priznanju statusa. To je odprlo vprašanja "o njihovem vplivu na poštenost postopkov ter njihovi ustavnosti in skladnosti z zakonodajo EU in mednarodnim pravom" (Varuh človekovih pravic 2021: 18).

Koliko je primerov diskriminacije?

V letu 2022 je Zagovornik načela enakosti (2022b) obravnaval skupno 353 primerov diskriminacije. Najpogosteje navedeni osebni razlogi diskriminacije v primerih, zaključenih leta 2022, je bila invalidnost (11,6 %), sledilo je državljanstvo (7,1 %), starost (6,5 %), spol (6,2 %) ter skupno število primerov z osebnimi okoliščinami narodnosti, rase in etničnega izvora (5,0 %).

Varuh človekovih pravic je, kot navaja v letnem poročilu za leto 2022, obravnaval skupno 271 primerov povezanih s tujci, kar je 60 % več kot prejšnje leto. Poleg tega so bili tujci obravnavani tudi v več drugih vsebinskih področjih. Večina primerov je bila povezana z vstopom, izstopom in bivanjem tujcev v državi. Tu se je število pritožb skoraj podvojilo, medtem ko se je na področju državljanstva število potrojilo. Večina pritožb se je nanašala na dolžino postopkov. Zlasti postopki na Upravni enoti Ljubljana in Upravni enoti Maribor (drugo največje mesto) so se večkrat izkazali za predolge. Po drugi strani pa ni bilo ugotovljenih neutemeljenih zamud v postopkih za začasno zaščito razseljenih oseb iz Ukrajine (Varuh človekovih pravic 2023).

Kot navaja Franet v Nacionalnem poročilu o temeljnih pravicah za leto 2023 za Slovenijo, policija še vedno ostaja eden redkih organov, ki lahko pridobi nekaj podatkov o kaznivih dejanjih, povezanih z etničnimi, rasnimi ali verskimi motivi nestrpnosti. Leta 2022 se je

policija ukvarjala z 18 sumi kaznivih dejanj, motiviranih z etnično/rasno nestrpnostjo, ter vložila 16 kazenskih ovadb pri pristojnem državnem tožilcu. Prav tako so preiskovali eno domnevno kaznivo dejanje, motivirano z versko nestrpnostjo, vendar kazenske ovadbe niso vložili. Podatki o teh incidentih, razčlenjeni po dodatnih podrobnostih ali osebnih okoliščinah, niso hranjeni.

Nekaj zaključkov

Zgoraj navedeni primeri diskriminacije, ki so bili obravnavani in rešeni s strani pristojnih institucij, dejansko kažejo, kako institucionalizirana hierarhija (ne le med državljani in tujci, ampak tudi med različnimi skupinami tujcev), pogosto ustvarjena z zakoni, vključuje in vzdržuje uveljavljene postkolonialne hierarhije, rasne odnose in predsodke. Raziskava o etnični diskriminaciji (Bajt 2023) kaže, da je obseg etnične in rasne diskriminacije v Sloveniji kljub obstoječim pravnim osnovam za njeno preprečevanje zelo problematičen. Čeprav je praksa merjenja diskriminacije skorajda neobstoječa, Bajt v svoji knjigi ponuja poglobljeno terensko raziskavo diskriminacije na več področjih življenja in poskuša meriti (etnično) diskriminacijo onstran uradnih statistik. Neenakopravno obravnavanje običajno krepijo predsodki, ki spremljajo diskriminatorne prakse in onemogočajo enakopravno obravnavo. Slabo znanje ali pomanjkanje razumevanja slovenskega jezika pogosto predstavlja oviro za dosego enakopravne obravnave kljub formalnim pravicam. Diskriminacija tujih državljanov je pogosta, medtem ko so mnoge osebe, rojene in živeče v Sloveniji, diskriminirane zgolj na podlagi svojega imena, barve kože, etničnega izvora, vere ali jezika. Podatki kažejo, da diskriminacijo najpogosteje doživljajo osebe, ki jih večinsko prebivalstvo obravnava kot tujce, in še posebej močno vpliva na prosilce za azil in begunce. Integracija v Slovenijo je torej daleč od dvostranskega procesa, migranti pa nosijo večino bremena in se preprosto poskušajo "zlititi" z okolico. Za nekatere pa je to nemogoče zaradi njihove barve kože ali z vero povezanega oblačenja, kot je naglavna ruta. Rasizirane manjšine so zagotovo najbolj izpostavljene izkušnjam diskriminacije in rasizma tako v prestolnici Ljubljani kot tudi preostalih delih Slovenije.

⁶ Dostopno na: <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2022-04/SloveniaNHRISubmission.pdf>

⁷ Če jim v 90 dneh po priznanju statusa ni uspelo začeti postopka združitve družine pod olajšanimi pogoji.

⁸ Dostopno na: <https://www.gov.si/novice/2023-10-18-z-nujno-novelo-zakona-o-tujcih-prilagajamo-pogoj-znanja-slovenskega-jezika/>

3. Lokalne prakse in izkušnje

Slovenija je še vedno obravnavana kot "homogena" družba, čeprav je - kot nekdanja republika Jugoslavija - tudi večverska in večetnična. Vendar imajo le člani italijanske in madžarske manjšine politični status avtohtonih manjšin, romska manjšina ima status posebne etnične skupnosti, medtem ko druge etnične skupine nimajo nobenega posebnega statusa in so jim dodeljene le nekatere kulturne pravice (Kogovšek Šalamon 2022). Socialno-ekonomske spremembe v zadnjih 20 letih, v katerih so se razmere glede dostopa do stanovanj, socialne oskrbe, zdravstvenega varstva in izobraževanja v veliki meri poslabšale za večino prebivalstva, so privedle do še večjih težav za migrantsko prebivalstvo. Povečanje priseljevanja v zadnjih 20 letih, še posebej v nekaterih večjih mestih v Sloveniji, je privedlo do spremenjene strukture prebivalstva in posledično do naraščajoče potrebe po prilagoditvi politik, strategij in praks. V nekaterih mestih in vaseh migrantsko prebivalstvo predstavlja izziv za lokalne skupnosti, ki se že soočajo s pomanjkanjem storitev (in tudi pomanjkanjem delovne sile) predvsem na področju zdravstva in izobraževanja.

Na žalost so migrantske skupnosti prve, ki utrpijo negativne posledice teh socialno-ekonomskih izzivov, medtem ko so populistično prikazani kot vsiljivci, ki so odgovorni za splošno neučinkovito socialno-ekonomsko in politično ravnanje v državi. Poleg tega v nekaterih lokalnih skupnostih zaradi pomanjkanja institucij, sredstev in izkušenj, lokalni politiki in prebivalci izvajajo pritiske za bolj restriktivno zakonodajo in manj pravic za priseljence, kar vpliva tudi na splošno klimo (ne)sprejemanja, ki bi bilo potrebno za kakršnokoli integracijo in dobrodošlico.

Področje migracij in integracije v Sloveniji je skoraj v celoti v pristojnosti države, lokalne oblasti pa ga prav tako večinoma dojemajo kot takšnega. Država na splošno ne deli obveznosti integracije z lokalnimi skupnostmi in jim ne zagotavlja znanja in sredstev za ta namen, čeprav se integracija večinoma odvija predvsem tam, kjer ljudje živijo, torej na lokalni ravni. Lokalne politike večinoma ne naslavlajo integracije tujcev. V osnutku integracijske strategije⁹ iz leta 2023 pa so predvideni nekateri pozitivni ukrepi za integracijo migrantov na lokalni ravni. Prvi je vključitev medkulturnih mediatorjev v vse ključne javne ustanove in zagotavljanje usposabljanja zanje. Drugi je razvoj modela za prenos določenih nalog integracije s strani države na lokalno raven. Tretji je izobraževanje in usposabljanje strokovnjakov za delo s tujci, četrti pa omogočanje dostopa do neprofitnih najemniških stanovanj in subvencije za tržne najemnine tudi za migrante.

Različne nevladne organizacije v Sloveniji se ukvarjajo z bojem proti rasizmu in diskriminaciji. Te organizacije pogosto igrajo ključno vlogo pri osveščanju, zagovarjanju sprememb politik in nudenju podpore žrtvam diskriminacije, ksenofobije ali rasističnih

⁹ Dostopno na: https://img.rtvsl.si/files/2023/10/06/28_481629802277634068_strategija2.pdf

napadov. Relevantne nevladne organizacije lahko razdelimo na dve glavni skupini: A) tiste, ki se osredotočajo na določeno skupino ljudi (na primer ljudi s telesnimi in duševnimi oviranostmi, LGBTIQ+, migrante, prosilce za azil in begunce, specifične manjšine, kot so Romi, žrtve nasilja itd.), ki ponavadi (ne vedno) nudijo tudi podporne storitve tem skupinam; in B) tiste, ki se borijo za človekove pravice in proti diskriminaciji na splošno, predvsem z raziskovanjem in zagovorništvom, prevzemajo vlogo čuvajev (watchdog) odločevalcev in ponavadi ne delajo neposredno z določenimi skupinami in ne zagotavljajo neposrednih storitev.

Kakšni so problemi?

Glavni problemi, ki so trenutno prisotni v Sloveniji v zvezi z diskriminacijo na podlagi osebnih okoliščin, kot so nacionalnost, državljanstvo, barva kože in vera, so naslednji: dostop do stanovanj, zaposlovanje in delovna mesta, dostop do storitev (npr. bančnih storitev in zdravstvene oskrbe) ter upravni postopki (Bajt 2021b).

A. Dostop do stanovanj

Eno najbolj problematičnih področij, kjer se migranti srečujejo z diskriminacijo, je na splošno pomanjkanje dostopnih stanovanj v Sloveniji. Najemnine so se v preteklih letih zelo zvišale (še posebej v Ljubljani), in zelo težko si je privoščiti primerno bivališče s povprečnimi ali celo podpovprečnimi plačami. Najemnine v Ljubljani so že tako previsoke, vendar so za migrante še višje kot za domačine. Glavni dodatni problem je diskriminacija s strani lastnikov stanovanj, ki ne želijo oddajati v najem migrantom na splošno, še posebej državljanom tretjih držav. Če stanovanje oddajo, mnogi lastniki ne izročijo najemne pogodbe ali ne navedejo dejanske višine najemnine v pogodbi, da bi se izognili plačevanju davkov (dobro vedoč, da s tem kršijo zakon). Prav tako pogodbe (če so že sklenjene) niso dolgoročne, saj običajno veljajo eno leto. Posledično se migranti srečujejo z nestabilnostjo in so pogosto prisiljeni v selitev, kar jim povzroča dodatne stiske, saj se morajo ponovno vključevati v novo okolje, zamenjati morajo vrtce, šole, zdravnike in celotno socialno mrežo soseske, ki je ključna za njihovo družbeno vključevanje in dobro počutje.

“Iskanje in najem stanovanja sta že nočna mora. Tudi za Slovence, razumem njihovo situacijo. Za tujce, za migrante, sploh za begunce je to najtežja stopnja. Iščejo leta, včasih živijo v zelo slabih prostorih, in iščejo, iščejo, veste. /.../ Tako je težko živeti na enem mestu več kot leto dni. Na splošno je to zaradi nekaterih razlogov, ki jih lastnik ne pojasni, preprosto sprejmete, povedo vam razlog, ki ga sploh ne imenujem, in potem zapustite ta kraj.” (F.)¹⁰

Eden največjih problemov je tudi, da lastniki ne dovolijo migrantom prijavo naslova za svoj

¹⁰ Da bi ohranili anonimnost intervjuvancev, uporabljamo samo začetnice psevdonima.

stalni naslov (ki ga potrebujejo za urejanje vseh drugih formalnosti, kot so dovoljenje za prebivanje, socialna pomoč, zdravstveno zavarovanje, pogodba o zaposlitvi itd.). Iskanje stanovanja včasih popolnoma prevzame življenje migrantov in vpliva na vse druge vidike vključevanja (delo, šola, jezikovni tečajji, tečajji socialne orientacije itd.), saj morajo ves čas iskati prostor za bivanje.

Kot kažejo obstoječe raziskave (Ladić et al. 2022) in naše fokusne skupine ter intervjuji, sta rasizem in diskriminacija na trgu nepremičnin daleč najbolj očitna in vztrajna. Udeleženci fokusnih skupin so poudarili, da so migranti enostavno nezaželeni na nepremičninskem trgu. Ženske migrantke z otroki (samohranilke) in velike družine (z več kot dvema otrokoma) so v najslabšem položaju. Izpostavljeno je bilo, da so ženske obravnavane slabše kot moški. Migrante običajno niti ne povabijo, da si ogledajo stanovanje, zato nekatere nevladne organizacije večkrat kličejo lastnike v njihovem imenu. Migranti so izključeni tudi iz vseh stanovanjskih programov na nacionalni in tudi lokalni ravni - v Ljubljani.

“Če pa je nekdo nov in išče stanovanje (..), to je kjer so ljudje razočarani, in nekateri so zapustili Slovenijo zaradi tega (..). Stanovanje je zelo težko najti v Ljubljani.” (E.)

Posebej težko je za prosilce za azil, ki so najprej prisiljeni živeti v nevzdržnih razmerah v azilnem domu, nato pa, po pridobitvi mednarodne zaščite, morajo azilni dom zapustiti v dveh tednih. Nekateri več mesecev iščejo sobo. Večina si ne more privoščiti najema celotnega stanovanja, zato tisti brez družin najpogosteje živijo s sostanovalci.

"Iskali smo šest mesecev in nismo mogli najti. In potem smo vse plačali, vse je bilo urejeno, zadnje podpise smo še nameravali urediti in potem je rekla gospa, malo starejša: 'Samo za vsak slučaj fantje, saj niste teroristi, kajne?' (smeh) To je bilo kot šala, vendar smo bili šokirani. 'Ne, nismo, se šalite?' 'Ne, ne, ne šalim se, samo sprašujem, veste, niste slabi fantje, kajne?' /.../ Mislim, to je podobno, kot ko greste v Združene države, se prijavite za vizo in vas vprašajo: 'Ste član kake teroristične organizacije?' (F.)

Afričan v fokusni skupini je omenil skriti rasizem: njegov agent za nepremičnine je rekel, da so našli stanovanje zanj in da je sreča, da ta lastnica ni rasistka; toda ko je lastnica videla tega moškega, je rekla, da je "preveč črn!"

Običajno lastniki nepremičnin zelo jasno zavračajo migrante kot najemnike: *"Ker sem tudi jaz klicala glede oglasov, so ljudje odkrito rekli, da ne, ne bi imeli opravka s teroristi." (M.); "Seveda, včasih sem iskal stanovanje, te pogledajo in rečejo 'oh, Afričan' ali 'ne maram te osebe.'" (D.); "Rekel sem, da sem iz Afganistana, in odgovorili so: 'Oprostite, ampak Afganistancem ne oddamo stanovanja.' In potem sem jo vprašal, zakaj, in je rekla 'ker to ni varna država'. Rekel sem ji, da Afganistan ni varna država, ampak jaz živim v Sloveniji." (E.)*

B. Zaposlovanje

V Sloveniji nobena institucija ne zbira podatkov o tem, koliko migrantov je zaposlenih. Zato manjkajo informacije za poglobljeno analizo tega področja. Čeprav ima večina kategorij migrantov dostop do trga dela, gre za vprašanje, kakšna dela dejansko dobijo – dela, povezana z njihovim lastnim poklicem, ali katera koli dela ali predvsem nekvalificirana fizična dela. Nekateri morda nimajo dokumentov s katerimi bi dokazali svoj poklic ali uradno izobrazbo (in težko jih je pridobiti). Slovenski jezik je ponavadi poudarjen kot glavna ovira, medtem ko v krajih, kjer delodajalci potrebujejo nizko plačano delovno silo, jezik ni predstavljen kot problem. NVO poročajo, da pri nekaterih nizko plačanih delih v tovarnah, kjer je delo povezano z visokimi tveganji, delodajalci raje zaposlujejo migrante iz balkanskih držav, ker so jeziki bolj podobni slovenskemu in je z njimi lažje komunicirati. Migranti z določenimi kvalifikacijami/veščinami se lahko zaposlijo hitreje kot tisti brez kakršnega koli posebnega znanja ali spretnosti. Nekateri od njih najdejo delo v različnih NVO, ki se ukvarjajo z begunci, npr. kot prevajalci in kulturni mediatorji, medtem ko je večina delovnih ponudb, ki jih dobijo od Zavoda za zaposlovanje, za pomoč v kuhinji v restavraciji, dostavo hrane ali druga fizična in slabo plačana dela v proizvodnji, gradbeništvu in industriji. Obstajajo tudi "etnične niše" za zaposlovanje v restavracijah, ki ponujajo etnično hrano. V eni od fokusnih skupin je bil naveden primer lastnika turške trgovine v Ljubljani, ki je kardiolog in ne more delati v svoji stroki (kljub pomanjkanju zdravnikov v Sloveniji), zato je odprl trgovino z živili.

“Mislim, da je to rasizem, ker so nam že na začetku nekaj blokirali. (Slovenija) ni kot druge države, ki ljudi vključijo v poklicna izobraževanja. Tako lahko gredo v šolo, končajo študij in ko en človek konča medicino, lahko gre (delat v) bolnišnico.” (E.)

Številni delodajalci ne razumejo zakonske podlage za zaposlovanje migrantov/beguncev in se raje odločijo, da ne bodo imeli "dodatnih težav" z njihovim zaposlovanjem (čeprav v večini primerov težav sploh ni). Večina migrantov ni seznanjena s svojimi pravicami in načini, kako jih uveljaviti, kot so npr. letni dopust, bolniška odsotnost, plačane nadure ali nočno delo itd. Na področju zaposlovanja, kot pravijo udeleženci naših fokusnih skupin, je "diskriminacija nora". Slabo jih obravnavajo ne samo Slovenci, temveč tudi drugi "prvorazredni" migranti, tisti, ki so že dlje časa v Sloveniji, ali tisti iz nekdanjih jugoslovanskih držav. Opazna je tudi razlika med migranti in "ex-pats".

V eni izmed fokusnih skupin je bil izpostavljen naslednji primer: ko so trije afričani prispeli v podjetje, kjer naj bi začeli delati, je bil šef vidno presenečen, da so črni. Povedal jim je, da bodo delali šest dni na teden, najprej v dveh izmenah in kasneje v treh – za enako plačo, kot je bila (preko zaposlovalne agencije) določena za delo pet dni na teden v samo eni, dopoldanski izmeni. V nočni izmeni so delali težje delo in to v mrazu brez kakršne koli zaščite; šef je rekel, naj si oblečejo svoje jakne. Na koncu se je izkazalo, da so morali delati samo v nočnih izmenah, medtem ko so Slovenci in nekateri drugi delavci delali samo v dopoldanskih izmenah. Udeleženec ene izmed fokusnih skupin je tudi omenil, da v Sloveniji moški, ki prihajajo iz Afrike, dobivajo pogodbe za krajši čas, za en mesec ali

morda tri. Če je zaposlitev tako negotova, ne morejo načrtovati svojega prihodnjega življenja in živijo iz meseca v mesec. "Če nisi Slovenec, dobiš težje delo in več dela."

"Prvi dan so nam dali 8-urne izmene in takoj so jih spremenili v 12-urne. Ampak plačani smo bili samo za 8 ur. /.../ In potem je bilo težko delo za nas, lažje delo pa ni bilo samo za Slovence ampak za belo kožo. /.../ Včasih nas sprašujejo: 'Zakaj prihajate sem v Slovenijo?' in če njih vprašaš, (od kod so) so to bili Makedonci, Bosanci, Hrvati, Srbi, ampak ne Slovenci." (E.)

Večina delavcev v fizičnih in storitvenih poklicih (restavracije, gradbeništvo) so tujci, delodajalci pa pogosto ne spoštujejo njihovih pravic in jim celo grozijo z besedami kot so: "Ali želiš delo ali svoje pravice?"

Vera ali izražanje vere je pogosto razlog za diskriminacijo, še posebej pri pokritih muslimanskih ženskah. Kot je bilo izpostavljeno v fokusnih skupinah, nihče ne želi zaposliti pokrite ženske. Ena izmed udeleženk fokusnih skupin se je želela vpisati v srednjo šolo, da bi postala vzgojiteljica ali medicinska sestra, vendar so jo odvrčali od poskusa vpisa zaradi njene naglavne rute – in ji predlagali, da bi se odkrila.

"Kar zadeva delovna mesta za žensko z naglavno ruto, (..) je to na ravni nemogočega. (smeh) To je nekakšen ogromen problem za Slovenijo, nihče noče prevzeti tveganja zaposlovanja ženske z ruto; /njegova prijateljica/ se je prijavila na veliko šol /.../ Ker je imela življenjepis, diplomo in vse s fotografijo, ampak takrat še ni imela rute, so jo sprejeli. Ko pa je šla v šolo, so jo vprašali 'Ali ste ista oseba? Ker niste imeli rute. Sprejeli bi vas, ampak ali obstaja kakšen drug način, kako bi lahko delali brez nje?.' To je velik problem, še posebej za ženske." (F.)

"Iskala sem vsa možna dela, rekla sem, da lahko tudi čistim, če kdo potrebuje, in ženska mi je rekla "OK, če boste delali brez rute, lahko pridete, na delovnem mestu ruto snamete, ko greste ven, jo lahko spet nadenete, potem lahko delate". Rekla sem "potem ne bom delala". Povedala sem ji, da ne bom čistila z ruto, ampak bom čistila z rokami /.../ Delo sem iskala eno leto. Na življenjepis nisem dala svoje fotografije in poslala sem življenjepis, po telefonu mi rečejo, da je vse v redu, "pridi na razgovor", in ko pridem, ko vidijo, da sem oblečena malo drugače, takoj rečejo "ne", ali da bodo poklicali nazaj in se nikoli ne oglasijo." (FR.)

Naši intervjuvanci in udeleženci fokusnih skupin so delili svoja opažanja in izkušnje, da v Ljubljani pokrite Muslimanke dobijo službe le pri nekaterih tujih podjetjih/trgovinah (kot so IKEA in Primark) ali določenih etničnih trgovinah, kavarnah ali restavracijah (kot so trgovine s turško hrano, egipčanska kavarna itd.).

V javnem sektorju ni pokritih žensk na nobenem položaju (vzgojiteljice, učiteljice), kar tudi prikazuje razliko med socialno-ekonomskim razredom, med moškimi migranti in ženskami migrantkami. Delodajalci pogosto nimajo razumevanja za potrebe migrantov. Ena od

intervjuvank se spominja, da so predlagali delodajalcem: "da bi imeli prostor, v tujini se reče prostor za meditacijo, ki pa je hkrati namenjen tudi ljudem različnih veroizpovedi, da se lahko umaknejo in imajo svoj verski obred v delovnem času, ker vemo, da marsikatera skupnost ima take obrede tudi večkrat na dan. In to je bilo sprejeto kot znanstvena fantastika. /.../ Antidiskriminacijski načrti, ki bi jih moral imeti vsak delodajalec, to je res še zelo v povojih pri nas." (M.).

Udeleženci fokusnih skupin in intervjuvanci so omenili, da bi morali migranti delati v državnih sektorjih, ki se ukvarjajo z migranti: "Mislim, da bi morali tujcem iz mnogih držav dovoliti delo v javnih uradih. /.../ Toda tukaj v Sloveniji, pokaži mi, kje se je to zgodilo. Ena oseba dela kje? Ne. /.../ Socialni delavci v azilnih centrih – morali bi biti tujci." (E.)

C. Dostop do storitev

Zdravstvo in socialno varstvo

Dostop do zdravstvene oskrbe je odvisen od vrste zdravstvenega zavarovanja (le osnovno ali tudi dopolnilno) in katere storitve krije (to velja za vse prebivalce Slovenije). Glavni problem je dostop do primarne zdravstvene oskrbe zaradi pomanjkanja splošnih zdravnikov tako za državljane kot tudi za migrante. Migranti se dodatno srečujejo z diskriminacijo in neprimernimi vprašanji v zdravstvenem sistemu zaradi predsodkov, stereotipov, pomanjkanja medkulturnih kompetenc in veščin, jezikovnih ovir, pomanjkanja finančnih sredstev in pomanjkanja časa za obravnavo vsakega pacienta (splošni zdravniki imajo na voljo le sedem minut na pacienta).

Jezik je velik problem, saj v zdravstvenem sistemu ni brezplačnih storitev tolmačenja/prevajanja ali prisotnosti medkulturnih mediatorjev. Nekateri NVO, ki delajo z begunci, imajo svoje medkulturne mediatorje ali tolmače, ki lahko spremljajo ljudi na zdravniške preglede. Vendar to ni sistematično zagotovljeno in tudi ne vedno (zlasti v urgentnih primerih). Potrebe po tolmačih naraščajo, otroci pa pogosto tolmačijo za svoje starše – pri zdravnikih (tudi ginekologih), centrih za socialno delo in upravnih enotah, kar je preveliko breme in odgovornost za otroka, ter ne bi smelo biti praksa. Neznanje jezika je za migrantke pereč problem še posebej v okviru socialnega in zdravstvenega varstva. Potrebna je sistematična rešitev.

Tujci, še posebej tisti z vidno versko pripadnostjo (npr. ruto), so opisali primere diskriminacije, s katero se srečujejo:

"Imela sem eno zdravnico, ampak enkrat mi je povedala, da je ne bo več, da moram najti drugega zdravnika. Potem sem videla, da še vedno dela tam, hotela me je le prepričati, naj najdem drugega zdravnika, ker me noče obravnavati. /.../ Moja učiteljica v šoli mi je pomagala – našli smo veliko zdravnikov, a ko so slišali, da sem tujka, so rekli, da nimajo

prostora in da me ne morejo sprejeti. To je tudi problem.” (FR.)

Podobna situacija velja za socialno varnost. Glavna ovira so zapleteni obrazci v slovenščini, zamude in dolge čakalne dobe. NVO poročajo, da nekateri centri za socialno delo ali posamezni socialni delavci, ki so tam zaposleni, niso seznanjeni s pravicami migrantov (in njihovimi statusi ter ustrezno zakonodajo), so nevedni pri pojasnjevanju in včasih neupravičeno zavračajo vloge za socialno pomoč, ali se namerno ne potrudijo govoriti angleško.

“Nekateri nočejo govoriti angleško, namerno /.../ Moj problem je bil, ko sem zaprosila za porodniški dopust. Bilo je mesec dni prej, ženska tam ni hotela izreči niti ene same angleške besede. In jaz sem bila ‘ok, ampak ne razumem, kaj pravite’. Potem sem ugotovila, da namerno ni hotela govoriti (angleško).” (AL.)

Poleg tega je pomanjkanje znanja o njihovih pravicah in statusu tudi na strani migrantov, zato potrebujejo ogromno pomoči prostovoljcev ali različnih organizacij, da se znajdejo v sistemu, izpolnijo obrazce, si zagotovijo tolmačenje in zagovorništvo itd.

Bančne storitve

Številni migranti se pogosto srečujejo s težavami pri odpiranju bančnih računov v Sloveniji – kar je bistveni pogoj za prejemanje plače ali socialne pomoči. Bilo je nekaj poskusov s strani državnih institucij, kot sta Zagovornik načela enakosti in Varuh človekovih pravic, ki so pojasnjevale bankam, da gre za obliko diskriminacije in da so banke dolžne odpreti osnovni račun vsaki osebi. Vendar še vedno obstajajo težave v praksi. Kot je dejal en izmed migrantov:

“Nisem razumel sistema v Sloveniji, pustite osebo kot prosilca za azil, mu izdate delovno dovoljenje, a ne more odpreti bančnega računa. Kar pomeni, da nimate moči nad svojimi bankami, zakaj torej izdate delovno dovoljenje? Kaj torej priporočate tem fantom, naj storijo /.../ saj vidite, da ni prejel plače en mesec.” (E.)

D. Izobraževanje in šole

Izobraževalno področje je med bolj odzivnimi glede integracije migrantov in beguncev. Po zakonodaji imajo migrantski otroci, ki prebivajo v Sloveniji, pravico do obiskovanja osnovne šole pod enakimi pogoji kot državljani Slovenije. Vendar se na ravni srednjega šolstva pod enakimi pogoji kot državljani Slovenije lahko vpišejo le državljani drugih članic EU, Slovenci brez slovenskega državljanstva in begunci. Pravica državljanov tretjih držav do izobraževanja temelji na načelu recipročnosti, kar pomeni na podlagi mednarodnih pogodb, število vpisnih mest za te študente pa določi Ministrstvo za izobraževanje (MiCREATE, 2019: 85). Osveščanje o beguncih in integraciji med učenci/dijaki in osebjem šol se izvaja na ad hoc (projektni) osnovi. Kakovost praks integracije torej niha in je odvisna od posameznih šol. Integracija migrantov je velik izziv za šole, še posebej za tiste, ki nimajo izkušenj. Seveda obstajajo tudi dobre prakse, kot je Osnovna šola Livada v Ljubljani.

Otroci, vpisani v vrtec (kar ni obvezno), se večinoma hitro naučijo slovenščine. Učenci osnovnih šol pa pogosto ne prejmejo zadostnega števila ur za učenje slovenskega jezika in ustrezno sledenje učni snovi. To velja še toliko bolj za dijake srednjih šol. Od šol je odvisno, ali zagotavljajo dodatne jezikovne tečaje s pomočjo učiteljev ali prostovoljcev. Ker je v Sloveniji le nekaj tujih (zasebnih) šol, ki so tudi zelo drage, migrantski otroci nimajo druge možnosti, kot da nadaljujejo šolanje v slovenščini. Enak izziv velja na terciarni ravni. V Ljubljani obstaja le en javni dodiplomski univerzitetni program v angleščini – na Ekonomski fakulteti.

Težava neznanja jezika v šolah je velika, kar so poudarili intervjuvanci in udeleženci naših fokusnih skupin. Migrantski otroci potrebujejo več podpore in več ur slovenščine, preden se vpišejo v šolo, pa tudi med prvim letom ali celo dlje. Težava je pomanjkanje osebja in sistematične državne strategije na tem področju. Zaradi tega komunikacija v šolah (med osebjem šole in starši) pogosto temelji na individualni pobudi, bodisi s strani šole bodisi s strani staršev, ki iščejo tolmače ali prevajalce. Tudi otroci pogosto prevajajo za svoje starše, ki ne govorijo slovensko, kar pa je zanje veliko breme in morda tudi ni v njihovem najboljšem interesu. Prav tako lahko povzroči nesporazume. Za tiste starše, ki govorijo angleško, je lahko lažje, vendar ni nujno:

“Vzgojitelji v vrtcu, čeprav znajo govoriti angleško, z ljudmi iz Turčije, ki sem jim pomagal, niso želeli govoriti angleško. Pravzaprav so jim rekli, da naj z njimi govorijo slovensko. Torej če ne govorijo slovensko, z njimi sploh nimajo sestankov, na primer zelo pomembnih sestankov, glede vzgoje otroka.” (F.)

V skladu z obstoječimi raziskavami (Bajt 2023) so naši udeleženci opozorili, da je rasizem v šolah še vedno prisoten. Omenjeno je bilo problematično vedenje nekaterih učiteljev do migrantskih otrok, pa tudi odnos lokalnih otrok in staršev do migrantskih otrok in staršev. Podanih je bilo veliko primerov, kot na primer ta, ko je otrok prinesel darila celotnemu razredu, razen enemu dečku – beguncu iz Sirije (in učiteljica ni reagirala); ali ko je učiteljica rekla učencu, da je zelo slab v branju slovenskega jezika in se ne bo nikoli izboljšal.

“Učiteljica mi je rekla, da moj otrok ne sme objemati drugih, ker starši tega ne dovolijo. Starši so šli večkrat k učiteljici in rekli ‘ne želimo, da ta otrok objema našega otroka.’” (FR.)

Rasizem je prisoten tudi med šolskim osebjem: *“pripombe profesorjev. /.../ Si počasen, si neumen ... to še vedno je.” (AN.)* Poudarjena je bila pomembnost vloge in občutljivosti učiteljev: *“Vem, da ima učitelj zelo velik vpliv na otroke. Če je rasist, bodo tudi otroci, če je dober, bodo otroci dobri.” (FR.)*

Poudarjena je bila pomembnost šol za proces integracije: *“Mislim, da tam, kjer šola dobro stoji, tudi družba dobro stoji. Dokler bo šola kolikor toliko stala bo tudi družba. Samo se včasih, če lahko bolj preprosto rečem, bojim, da so šole še zadnje trdnjave, ki nam nudijo*

varnost, kjer dijak sedem ur večinoma ni izpostavljen nekemu nasilju, je pod streho in to. Za preostanek dneva pa mi več ne vemo." (AN.)

Vendar so udeleženci fokusnih skupin menili tudi, da *"morda pričakujemo preveč od šol, saj so šole javne institucije, zaposleni pa so pogosto rasisti."* Naveden je bil primer več telefonskih klicev ravnateljem, da bi jim ponudili izobraževanje za delo z migrantskimi otroki, na kar je en ravnatelj odgovoril: *"Na srečo tukaj nimamo priseljencev."*

Stigmatizacija oblačenja, ki kaže protimuslimanske občutke, je posebej pereča za Muslimanke, saj se nekatere matere celo sramujejo iti v šolo. Otroci so zasmehovani s strani sošolcev zaradi svojih imen in oblačil. Problem je tudi kulturna (ne)občutljivost šolskih delavcev glede kulturnih posebnosti. Na primer, siljenje otrok k uživanju hrane in pijače med ramazanom. Čeprav se je v takšnih primerih med udeleženci pojavilo tudi vprašanje "kje je meja tolerance?" (v smislu ali naj podpiramo post med ramazanom za otroke, ki hodijo v šolo in morajo biti aktivni ves dan).

Drugo pomembno vprašanje in paradoks je v nepovezanosti med institucijami in sistemi. V Ljubljani živijo tudi nedokumentirani migranti, vključno z ženskami in otroki. Čeprav šole lahko (in običajno tudi) sprejmejo kogar koli, ne glede na dokumente, in otroci lahko hodijo v šolo, niso nikjer registrirani in formalno ne obstajajo (nimajo statusa, socialne varnosti, zdravstvenega varstva, itd.). Naveden je primer dekleta, ki je končalo osnovno in srednjo šolo v Ljubljani brez kakršnih koli dokumentov in šele preden je dopolnilo 18 let, je z veliko težavo in s pomočjo nevladnih organizacij uredilo svoj pravni status in dokumente.

Kot situacija romskih otrok in izključenost romske skupnosti na vseh ravneh (Bajt 2022b) se kaže podobno stanje tudi pri migrantskih otrocih in migrantskih skupnostih. Iz naših fokusnih skupin v Ljubljani izhaja, da so težave romskega prebivalstva povezane z razširjenim institucionalnim zanemarjanjem, zlasti v izobraževanju: romski otroci ne obiskujejo šole, romske ženske pa se ne udeležujejo sestankov v šoli, kar sta oba problema slovenskega institucionalnega zanemarjanja romskega prebivalstva in zelo rasističnih odnosov do Romov v institucijah. Center za socialno delo ne poroča, ko romski otroci ne obiskujejo šole, medtem ko bi v enakem primeru glede drugih otrok institucije takoj ukrepale. Obstaja velika razlika med *vpisom* v šolo/vrtec in dejanskim *obiskom* šole/vrtca. Neudeležba pouka ni sankcionirana. Čeprav je na primer Mestna občina Ljubljana organizirala prevoze in zagotovila osebje, ki je hodilo od vrat do vrat, da bi romske otroke pripeljali v šolo, romski otroci še vedno ne obiskujejo šole. Omenjeno je bilo tudi naraščajoče priseljevanje Romov v neurejeno naselje Ljubljana Brod in dejstvo, da je veliko romskih staršev nepismenih in ne govorijo tekoče slovenskega jezika.

E. Možnosti učenja jezika in socialna orientacija

Migranti poročajo, da 400 ur tečaja slovenščine ni dovolj za usvojitev tekočega govora. Večina doseže osnovno raven A1 ali A2. Nekateri bi želeli nadaljevati učenje in obiskovati nadaljevalni tečaj, kar pa je zanje predrago. Država namreč ne zagotavlja nadaljnjih brezplačnih tečajev. Ljudje pogosto nimajo priložnosti vaditi pogovorno slovenščino, če nimajo socialne mreže ali zaposlitve v Sloveniji. Tisti, ki govorijo angleško, pogosto še naprej komunicirajo v angleščini, namesto da bi poskušali komunicirati v slovenščini.

Programi socialne orientacije ne zadovoljujejo obstoječih potreb. Morali bi se izvajati sistematično, ne pa preko projektov z omejenim trajanjem in omejenimi finančnimi ter človeškimi viri.

Udeleženci fokusnih skupin pričajo, da lahko Slovenci postanejo nevljudni, če nekdo (tujec, ki želi živeti v Sloveniji) ne obvlada jezika. Ravno jezik najpogosteje "odpira vrata"; udeleženci so omenili, da je treba poskusiti govoriti slovensko, da bi dobili prijaznejši odziv: "Jezik je ključ." Udeleženca begunca je profiliral policist na železniški postaji. Začel je govoriti v slovenščini, nato pa je želel nadaljevati v angleščini, saj se ni spomnil vseh izrazov. Policist se je nanj takoj razjezil. V tem hipu so šli mimo turisti iz Nemčije in ta isti policist je z njimi brez težav govoril angleško. To je bil očiten primer diskriminacije beguncev s strani policije, kar je udeleženec naše fokusne skupine policistu tudi povedal.

Udeleženci fokusnih skupin menijo, da se je težko v kratkem času naučiti slovenščine in da zgolj tečaji niso dovolj. Osredotočenost na učenje jezika je včasih ovirana zaradi travmatičnih izkušenj beguncev: *"Ali se lahko resnično osredotočiš na učenje jezika, preden svojo družino spraviš na varno mesto?"* Nekateri predstavniki nevladnih organizacij so omenili, da je učenje vsakdanjega/pogovornega jezika lažje zlasti za moške. Problem je, da so ženske večinoma doma, medtem ko imajo moški službe in so bolj aktivni zunaj doma. Tudi popoldanske ure so težava za ženske, saj nimajo varstva za otroke, njihovi partnerji pa so večinoma v službi. Prav tako je metoda izvajanja izpita za pridobitev potrdila o usposobljenosti problematična: frontalna ustna predstavitev je težavna za mnoge. Veliko žensk je obiskovalo in dokončalo tečaj, vendar ni pridobilo dovolj jezikovnega znanja. Udeleženci nevladnih organizacij poudarjajo, da je bolje uporabiti individualen pristop, poučevanje ene ali dveh žensk hkrati, saj se tako hitreje učijo.

Problem je tudi pomanjkanje sodnih tolmačev in dejstvo, da se migranti in tolmači poznajo, kar v praksi lahko pomeni pristranskost tolmača – in, kot so pokazali nekateri primeri, lahko predstavlja ogromno težavo, zlasti v primerih ločitve in/ali nasilja v migrantski družini.

F. Institucije

Več intervjuvancev, tako migrantov kot strokovnjakov, je poudarilo, da v Ljubljani migranti večinoma doživljajo diskriminacijo s strani javnih institucij in pri dostopu do upravnih storitev. V eni od fokusnih skupin je bilo izpostavljeno, da je sistem sam po sebi rasističen.

In če institucije dovoljujejo rasizem, kako lahko pričakujemo, da bodo ljudje drugačni? *"Država ljudem daje dovoljenje za diskriminacijo. Če to počne država, ljudje vidijo, da je to dovoljeno početi tudi njim."*

V kontekstu javnih institucij in njihovih pisarn je bilo večkrat omenjeno "nevljudno vedenje" in "pomanjkanje empatije": *"Vse se začne tam, veš, vsaka javna oblast, izobraževalne ustanove, imajo podobne odnose, dejansko se ne ukvarjajo z migranti ali tujci. Želijo, da oni sami rešijo svoje težave, želijo, da se sami naučijo jezika, brez njihove pomoči."* (F.)

Udeleženci so se pogosto pritoževali nad postopki, se strinjali, da je birokracija v Sloveniji zelo zapletena in da manjka zdrav razum v postopkih. *"Birokracija v Sloveniji je kot Kafkin grad - oni (uradniki) živijo v svojem svetu in delajo zase."* Prav tako so povedali, da včasih ne vedo, kaj je hujše – neposreden napad na cesti ali prehod skozi ta birokratski sistem: *"Rečejo: 'Vaš primer je zelo težaven!' - Oni (uradniki) vam /urejanje kakršnekoli upravne zadeve/ napravijo krvavo težko"*.

Ena od udeleženk je rekla: *"Vedno imam občutek, da me gledajo tako, kot da želim goljufati sistem."*

Uradniki pristopajo tudi neprofesionalno, saj sprašujejo: *"Zakaj ste prišli v Slovenijo?"* Ali izkušnja druge udeleženke: *"Prosili so me, naj umaknem vlogo, potem ko sem leta čakala z zelo malo ali brez novic o upravnem postopku za pridobitev slovenskega državljanstva."*

Uradniki po mnenju migrantov pogosto zadržujejo informacije: *"Rečejo le 'Ne vem' in se ne trudijo najti informacij ali vprašati nekoga. Ne dajejo nam informacij, nasvetov ali navodil, kakor bi jih dali drugim ljudem."* In pogosto dajejo komentarje na podlagi imen in priimkov, kot na primer *"Oh, zelo dobro govorite slovensko"* – je bila pripomba uradnika na Upravni enoti Ljubljana moškemu, ki je bil rojen v Ljubljani in tudi celo življenje živi v Ljubljani.

Rasistična stališča zaradi različnih imen in priimkov so bila izpostavljena kot neposredno dejanje diskriminacije: *"Če si na -ić, si zanič."* Kar pomeni, da si dober za nič, če se tvoj priimek konča z -ić (predvsem hrvaški, bosanski, srbski). Ali: *"A to vam je šiptarsko ime?"* Kar pomeni: ali je tvoje ime albansko? Rečeno v slengu, z zelo slabšalnim, rasističnim tonom. To je npr. vprašal policaj našega udeleženca med identifikacijo na ulici v središču Ljubljane.

Udeleženci fokusnih skupin so opozorili, da uradniki pogosto ne govorijo tujih jezikov (niti angleško), ali tudi če znajo jezik, pogosto zavračajo pogovor v angleščini. Udeleženci so bili frustrirani: *"Kdo drug pride na oddelek za tujce kot tujci?! Kako lahko delate na oddelku za tujce, če ne govorite niti enega tujega jezika?"* Uradniki na upravnih enotah večinoma ne govorijo angleško. *"Ko gre za jezik, je res težava. In ne vem zakaj, oh, vem zakaj, ker so nam enkrat povedali na integracijskem tečaju, da je to kot odločitev vlade, da morajo govoriti slovensko."* (AL.).

Po mnenju udeležencev rasizem pomeni dvojne standarde in rasna hierarhija je očitna. Institucije obravnavajo "nove migrante" podobno kot Rome ali kot je nacizem obravnaval Jude. Zaposleni "razvrščajo ljudi v različne škatle" glede na njihovo poreklo in obstaja različna obravnava za različne narodnosti. Tisti, ki prihajajo iz držav vzhodno ali južno od Slovenije, veljajo za večji "problem". Bili so opaženi komentarji na Upravni enoti Ljubljana, ki kažejo, kako zaposleni razmišljajo in hierarhizirajo različne narodnosti/celine. Dvojni standardi so bili opaženi še posebej pri obravnavi beguncev – na primer, razlikovanje med ukrajinskimi begunci in vsemi drugimi begunci.

Upravne enote državljanke Združenega kraljestva obravnavajo drugače po brexitu, saj niso več del EU. *"Ti si Britanec in zdaj po brexitu te bomo dali v isto škatlo kot Afričane in Indijce"*. To je rekel javni uslužbenec na Upravni enoti Ljubljana, ko je tujec oddal vlogo za slovensko državljanstvo. Bili so tudi primeri diskriminacije s strani drugih migrantov, zaposlenih na upravni enoti, npr. migrantov iz držav nekdanje Jugoslavije: *"Odkrito vam povedo, da na upravni enoti žal ni Makedoncev, ki bi vam pomagali s svojimi vezami."*

Taki odnosi prav tako sprožajo vprašanje razredne intersekcije med migranti. Na eni od fokusnih skupin je nastopil celo trenutek osveščanja med "revnejšimi" migranti, ki so osveščali tiste, ki bi jih verjetno označili kot "ex-pats". Večina migrantov pa ni bila sposobna prepoznati sistema ali države kot glavnega vira rasne diskriminacije; večinoma so iskali "Drugega", ki bi bil kriv za njihove težave (drugi migranti, drugi begunci, razprava o tem, kdo ima več pravic do česa, opozarjanje na dvojne standarde itd.).

Družbeno-ekonomska situacija osebe, razred in premoženje, prav tako igrajo pomembno vlogo pri rasni diskriminaciji. Kako (bogato) oseba izgleda, pomeni veliko razliko: *"Če imaš denar, je polovica tvojih težav rešenih."* *"Vpliva na to, kako te ljudje sprejmejo ali prenašajo; ljudje drugače gledajo na 'revne' priseljence. Če se lepše oblečeš, te ljudje drugače gledajo."* En udeleženec je omenil, da se mu to pogosto dogaja: *"Ljudje pogosto mislijo, da sem Arabec; sprva ne ugotovijo, da sem iz Brazilije, in takoj, ko to ugotovijo, me bolje obravnavajo (še vedno ne dobro, ampak bolje)." Ko prečka slovenske meje, je dejal, policisti vedno komentirajo, kako zelo imajo radi Brazilijo in nogomet in podobno – tako ga obravnavajo kot "eksotičnega" migranta.*

Videz je zelo pomemben element, kako bo nekdo obravnavan. Ljudje sodijo in si predstavljajo stvari na podlagi videza (bogat-reven, temnopolt/črn, zakrit). *"Vedno si viden, torej je že samo vidnost povezana z veliko odgovornostjo v družbi. /.../ Slovenci so zelo togi glede svojega načina življenja, glede svojih pravil – od smeti do prometa, vsega. Tudi če Slovenci tega včasih ne počnejo, pa zahtevajo od vsakogar, da se drži vsakega pravila bolje kot oni sami."* (F.)

"Diskriminacija, ki je nevidna, ni neposredna, ampak jo lahko čutiš. Nevidna diskriminacija je resničen problem, ker ko je vidna, se lahko odzoveš, lahko ukrepaš, lahko prijaviš, lahko se pritožiš. Toda nevidna je zelo težka. In ponavadi lahko prihaja tudi od ljudi, ki imajo avtoriteto, imajo neko odločevalsko funkcijo." (AL.).

Predpostavka o odsotnosti rasizma v Sloveniji povzroča še več težav pri prepoznavanju le-tega in pri boju proti rasizmu. Aktivistka iz nevladne organizacije je v intervjuju povedala: *"Ljudje zelo z lahkoto rečejo, da pri nas rasizma ni, kar sem celo doživela pri usposabljanju delovnih inšpektorjev, ki so rekli, oziroma celo ena predstavnica sindikata je bila, ki je rekla, saj pri nas se ne moremo pogovarjati o rasizmu, če pa imamo 100 črncev. /.../To zanikanje, oziroma ne samo zanikanje tudi celo mogoče ta drugi del dobrohotnega nekega odziva na to, češ ne, saj smo vsi enaki, saj barve kože ni pomembna, to je hkrati pa tudi en podaljšek rasizma. S tem pa ti sploh onemogočaš ta boj za pravice, če rečeš, saj je vse v redu, saj ni nič narobe, jaz ne vidim barve. To je pač njihov najlepši odziv. Da smo vsi nevtralni." (M.)*

Isti intervjuvanka je delila pomembno sporočilo: *"Ne moremo se delati, da mi nismo dediči teh rasističnih pogledov na svet, ki so oblikovali razmere moči v katerih še vedno živimo. Naš največji problem je, da se teh stvari ne govori naglas, da se jih ne prizna. Najprej moramo popraviti zgodovinske krivice. /.../ To je primer pospeševanja teh zakoreninjenih predsodkov do določene celine, recimo. In ne moremo se pretvarjati, da to ne spodbuja določenih rasističnih pogledov na svet, neke manjvrednosti nekoga drugega, ki nima barve kože, kot jo imaš ti." (M.)*

G. Javni prostori

Rasizem in ksenofobija se zdita zelo globoko zakoreninjena v slovenski družbi. Prežeta sta z različnimi stereotipi, ki ljudi vodijo v interakcijah s tujci/migranti. V Sloveniji je veliko migrantov (okoli 200.000) in veliko turistov. Udeleženci fokusnih skupin in intervjuvanci so omenili dvojne standarde v Ljubljani: turisti so zelo dobrodošli, vendar če migranti želijo ostati, niso več dobrodošli. Ob začetku fokusne skupine so udeleženci menili, da je v Ljubljani preveč turistov, vendar je po razpravi in nekaj premisleka eden od njih rekel: *"Če govorim angleško, mislijo, da sem turist. Torej se trudim, da se v Ljubljani predstavim kot turist." Tako, pravi, je bolje obravnavan. Eden od intervjuvancev je dejal: "Če si turist, je vse v redu, si dejansko najbolj zaželena oseba v Sloveniji. In potem spremeniš svoj status (...) tudi začasne, okej; ampak ko si stalni (prebivalec), je to pravzaprav res težko." (F.)*

Stereotipi o migrantih še vedno prevladujejo v splošnem mnenju javnosti in migranti to čutijo: *"Skupnost nam sporoča, da smo tukaj samo, da jim vzamemo denar, in da smo morda neumni ljudje, leni ljudje, da nismo nič produktivni, smo tukaj samo zato, ker hočemo njihov denar itd." (AL.)* Eden od učiteljev je v intervjuju dejal: *"Zelo preprosti ljudje, ali pa tudi, ko se pogovarjam z dijaki, še vedno vidijo migrante kot nekoga, ki jim bo odvzel službo. Vse bo imel plačano, vse mu bo poslano. Tudi mediji po svoje naredijo veliko dobrega in slabega na tem področju. Mislim, da se še vedno kar precej – Ljubljana ne toliko – vaške skupnosti bojijo migrantov." (AN.)*

Migranti se pogosto soočajo s vprašanji, kot so: *"V kateri kitajski restavraciji delaš?"* To je vprašanje, ki ga je zdravnik postavil ženski iz srednjeazijske države, pri čemer je izrazil

stereotipno predstavo na podlagi njenega videza, čeprav je antropologinja. Njihovo izobrazbo se šteje za manjvredno ali jim ne verjamejo, da jo sploh imajo: *"Ali res imaš doktorat, kot ga imamo tukaj?"* Brazilec z doktoratom iz zgodovine pravi, da pogosto dobi to vprašanje. Ali primer Palestinke z magisterijem: *"Ljudje me sprašujejo 'Res?' Sploh si ne morejo predstavljati, da sem študirala v angleščini in hodila na univerzo z ameriškim programom."*

Več udeležencev je omenilo rasizem na javnih mestih v Ljubljani, predvsem verbalne, včasih pa tudi fizične napade. En udeleženec (moški iz arabske države) je opisal verbalni napad nanj, ko je čakal na zeleno luč na prehodu. Vendar je bila prisotna priča (ženska), ki jo je ta napad zmotil. Obrnila se je k napadenemu in mu rekla, da vsi niso takšni kot napadalec. Drug primer je bil napad na žensko iz Makedonije, ki je sprehajala psa in se pogovarjala po telefonu v makedonščini. Moški na kolesu jo je slišal, se ustavil in ji pljunil pred noge. To se je zgodilo pred vrtcem. Okoli je bilo še nekaj ljudi, ki so dogodek opazovali, vsi so se zgražali nad moškim, vendar nihče ni posredoval.

Rasizem na javnih mestih je še posebej usmerjen proti muslimankam, ki nosijo naglavno ruto. Ko sta dve ženski z ruto vprašali voznika, ali gre določen avtobus v Ljubljano, je odgovoril 'NE' in odpeljal avtobus, dejansko, v Ljubljano. Udeleženka je tudi omenila, da ostane sedež poleg nje na avtobusu prazen, saj domačini (zlasti odrasli) očitno nočejo sedeti poleg ženske z ruto. Pogosto, ko se usede k nekemu, ta oseba takoj vstane.

Predstavljena je bila tudi zgodba o ženski, ki jo je na otroškem igrišču pred otroki oklofutala druga ženska, Slovenka, zaradi njene naglavne rute. Posledice rasizma so vidne tudi v odnosih med otroki. Med sprehodom po parku je neka družina srečala sošolca svojih otrok, s katerim se igrajo v šoli. V parku je bil tudi ta sošolec s svojo družino, vendar se je delal, da jih ne pozna. Mlajši otrok je vprašal mamo, kako to, da ga sošolec niti ne pogleda? Bilo ji je težko pojasniti otrokoma, da očitno starši njegovemu sošolcu niso dovolili, da bi se pogovarjal z njimi. Prav tako se sosodje *"ne pogovarjajo z nami, pogovarjajo se z vsemi razen z nami. /.../ povedali so drugemu prijatelju, naj X (otrok) nikoli ne pozvoni na njihova vrata in ne sprašuje za X (otroka), sicer ga bo njegov oče kaznoval." (AL.)*

Migranti so izpostavljeni tudi stalnemu nadzoru na javnih mestih in v trgovinah. V trgovini s pohištvom je varnostnik ustavil družino iz Bližnjega vzhoda – le njih, ne pa tudi drugih ljudi, ki so istočasno zapuščali trgovino. Varnostnik jih je vprašal, kaj imajo v torbah, in celo pregledoval otroški voziček. Moški je takoj reagiral in varnostnika opozoril, da ni ustavil nikogar razen njih. Njihovi otroci so bili zmedeni in spraševali, kaj se dogaja. Prav tako je bilo večkrat omenjeno policijsko etnično in rasno profiliranje (Bajt 2022b) na javnih mestih. Policisti ustavljajo tiste ljudi, ki drugače izgledajo (zlasti temnopolte) na ulici, preverjajo njihove dokumente – očitno predvsem moške.

H. Profirasizem: samoobramba, prijave in reakcije opazovalcev

Skoraj vsi udeleženci so izjavili, da sami ali ljudje, ki jih poznajo, skoraj nikoli ne prijavijo takšnih dejanj. Ne verjamejo, da bi prijava karkoli izboljšala; ponavadi se ne zgodi nič; ne verjamejo, da se spleča. Ne morejo dokazati diskriminacije v osebni situaciji. *"Nisem / prijavila/, ker vem, da ne bo pomagalo. Vem, ko se to zgodi veliko prijateljem in so poskusili kaj storiti, ampak nič ni bilo iz tega. Ni rezultata. Ne bo pomagalo."* (FR.)

Strokovnjakinja iz nevladne organizacije je dejala, da: *"ni odziva, ergo to je sprejemljivo. Sprejemljivo ravnanje, sprejemljiv govor, sprejemljivo vedenje in to je tisto, kar je problem."* (M.). Druga intervjuvanka je dejala: *"ko sem peljala otroka z vozičkom na avtobus, je voznik zaprl vrata, ko je bil voziček na sredini, med vrati, tako da je skoraj padla. In bila je res ogrožena, jaz sem si mislila 'kaj je to sranje' in hči je kričala /.../ Nihče ni posredoval v nobenem primeru, nihče."* (AL.)

Druga ženska, ki je nosila naglavno ruto, je sprehajala svoje otroke po središču Ljubljane, ko je lokalna ženska začela nanjo vpiti: *"Pojdi nazaj v svojo državo, zapusti Slovenijo, pusti denar, tukaj si samo zaradi socialne pomoči, otroških dodatkov!"* (FR.) Okoli njiju je bilo veliko ljudi, a nihče ni posredoval.

Vendar so udeleženci fokusne skupine prav tako omenili potrebo po osveščanju in da se *"morajo migranti postaviti zase!"* še posebej ob dejstvu, da se zanje ne postavi nihče ali le redko kdo. Ko je bila udeleženska fokusne skupine na ulici napadena zaradi nošenja naglavne rute, je izrazila zadovoljstvo, ker se je odzvala in branila. Verjame, da je pomembno, da se ljudje branijo in uprejo, če so izpostavljeni rasni diskriminaciji. Jezik lahko predstavlja težavo, vendar je izkusila, da je še vedno možno se odzvati: *"Naredila sem to v arabščini, in delovalo je dobro. Razumela je. In drugi ljudje so opazovali in tudi oni so razumeli."*

Niso pa vsi enako odporni, saj se lahko bojijo reakcij, imajo slabe izkušnje, travme itd. Kot primer je bil naveden fizični napad na avtobusu: ženska je udarila drugo žensko po glavi, ker je nosila naglavno ruto. Toda žrtev se ni odzvala, ni se branila. In drugi so le stali ob strani. Žrtve morajo biti opolnomočene, da se lahko odzovejo na rasistične napade.

4. Potrebe, omejitve in priložnosti: Kaj bi bilo treba in kaj bi bilo mogoče storiti, da bi Ljubljana postala "mesto za vsakogar"?

V tem zadnji delu so predstavljeni rezultati terenskega dela kot priporočila za spremembe, izboljšave na institucionalni ravni in ideje, kako preprečiti ter kako se odzvati na rasizem, ksenofobijo, nestrpnost in diskriminacijo v Ljubljani. Poleg tega so vključene izkušnje in dileme nevladnih organizacij. Priporočila, predvsem na področjih dostopa do stanovanj, zaposlovanja, dostopa do storitev in aktivnega vključevanja migrantov v oblikovanje njihovih priložnosti na lokalni ravni, so bila ustvarjena s participativnim pristopom v fokusnih skupinah in so jih večinoma oblikovali sodelujoči v fokusnih skupinah sami.

Migranti (zlasti v prvih mesecih in po priznanju statusa) se soočajo s hudimi eksistencialnimi težavami, zato pogosto nimajo ne energije ne motivacije, da bi razmišljali o tem, kako se aktivno vključiti v socialno okolje ali civilno družbo. Njihovo sodelovanje je pogosto organizirano prek dejavnosti nevladnih organizacij. Pogosto so aktivno vključeni v prostovoljno delo znotraj nevladnih organizacij, nekateri pa ustanavljajo svoja lastna društva in nevladne organizacije. Predstavniki oz. strokovnjaki iz nevladnih organizacij poudarjajo, da pristojne institucije dosledno ignorirajo delo nevladnih organizacij z migrantskim prebivalstvom, zato niso sposobne vzpostaviti partnerskega odnosa v korist tako migrantov kot družbe gostiteljice. Imajo največ izkušenj na terenu, delajo z migranti različnih statusov in vsakodnevno rešujejo različne vrste problemov. Imajo strokovno znanje in dosledno spremljajo razvoj tako na nacionalni kot mednarodni ravni. Zelo so opremljene z znanjem in izkušnjami, na podlagi katerih lahko predstavijo ideje za politične in praktične spremembe. Kljub temu pa so ignorirane. Dobre prakse obstajajo le skozi nezanesljivo/kratkoročno projektno financiranje namesto sistematičnega izvajanja.

Vprašanja se pojavljajo o tem, kako doseči specifične in včasih zelo zaprte migrantske skupnosti (npr. albansko) ter kako obravnavati patriarhat, ki se kaže v praksi pri delu z migranti (npr. konzervativnimi muslimanskimi moškimi, s katerimi nekatere nevladne organizacije sodelujejo). Nevladne organizacije se sprašujejo, ali je sploh prav, da to počnejo? Kje je meja med sprejemljivim in nesprejemljivim v neenakih razmerjih moči v teh skupnostih, še posebej glede na razlike med spoloma? Ali obstaja omejitev demokraciji in toleranci – kjer ne more biti nobene tolerance do kršitev ustavne enakosti in pravic? Kako zagotoviti ustavno enakost v teh primerih? Ali naj bi bile nevladne organizacije tolerantne do tega, da ženskam ni dovoljeno sodelovati v dejavnostih zaradi njihovih mož ali lastnih migrantskih skupnosti? Kako obravnavati primere izginotja deklic/otrok, ki so

prodane v zakonske zveze in podvržene trgovini z ljudmi? Udeleženci fokusnih skupin so se strinjali, da bi morali ta dejanja prijaviti kot kazniva dejanja in da v teh primerih ne bi smelo biti argumenta "kulturnega razlikovanja".

Zgovoren primer je bil omenjen v zvezi z albansko deklico, dijakinjo, ki jo je predstavil intervjuvanec učitelj: *"Dijakinja je bila Albanka, skoraj odlična. Prišla je h kolegu družboslovcu in mu je rekla: 'ali bi mi vi lahko dali popravnega?' To me je pretreslo. Pa pravi on potem: 'kako to misliš, saj imaš lepe ocene'. Je rekla: 'čim naredim šolo, grem v Albanijo'. Ker je prodana." (AN.)*

Po mnenju udeležencev fokusnih skupin iz migrantskih skupnosti se mora civilna družba močno boriti, da spremeni stvari, saj država ne bo sama sprožila boja proti rasizmu. Nevladne organizacije bi morale tudi ustvariti prostor, kjer se migranti lahko razvijajo, razvijajo svoje potenciale in spretnosti kot posamezniki. Hkrati pa je udeleženec opozoril: *"Ampak ne postavljajte nas kot eksotične primere,"* saj to predstavlja obrnjeni (benevolentni) rasizem. Nekatere nevladne organizacije sicer vključujejo migrante v svoje delo in dejavnosti. Vendar pa je eden izmed intervjuvancev pripomnil, da so nekatere nevladne organizacije še vedno zelo zaprte in ne sprejemajo migrantov v svoje vrste: *"Nevladne organizacije tvorijo zaprt krog kjer ni mogoče prebiti te meje, sodelujejo le med seboj, resnični ljudje, ki imajo težave, kot je naša organizacija, pa imajo težave s sodelovanjem. Odkar smo leta 2017 ustanovili svojo organizacijo, se soočamo z blokado nevladnih organizacij, ki nočejo sodelovati z nami. Poskušamo najti različne poti, da nas ne morejo več utišati. Tako so prisiljeni, da nam pomagajo, rečemo, delajmo skupaj, in to smo dolgo časa iskali." (D.)*

Protirasistična strategija in opolnomočenje migrantov

Udeleženci fokusnih skupin in intervjuvanci so izrazili, da je vprašanje moči pomembno in da morajo biti v položajih moči prisotni različni ljudje. Potrebne so afirmativne akcije in pozitivna diskriminacija. V Sloveniji/Ljubljani ni protirasistične in protidiskriminacijske strategije, kar pa bi bilo nujno potrebno. Poleg tega, in strategija bi to morala podpirati, morajo migranti sami najti način, kako postati akterji proti rasizmu v Sloveniji in samostojno zahtevati spremembe. Boj migrantov bi moral biti spodbujan, vzporedno z bojem delavcev (ali npr. bojem temnopoltih ljudi v ZDA), saj lahko država, nevladne organizacije, socialne službe, šole in lokalne skupnosti opravijo le en del. Tako sta bili izpostavljeni dve stvari: delovanje migrantov samih na eni strani in vključujoče politike ter dejavnosti države in večinske populacije na drugi.

Nujno je krepiti opolnomočenje migrantov, ki so že dlje časa v Ljubljani, da postanejo glas novih migrantov: *"Vsekakor pa sem vedno mnenja, da se nikoli ne moremo pogovarjati o nekom, brez tistega človeka oziroma skupnosti. Nič o nas brez nas." (M.)* Ali kot so dejali udeleženci migrantskih fokusnih skupin: *"nobena politika o migracijah brez migrantov."*

Udeleženci fokusnih skupin so poudarili, da bi morali biti migranti tudi vztrajni in odporni v primerih rasizma. Da bi to dosegli, je potrebno opolnomočiti ali podpirati migrante ter jih naučiti, kako biti odporni. Pomembno je tudi, da imajo zagovornike, ki pristopijo na migrantsko stran (na primer na ulici) in jih podprejo. Pri tem je pomembno razlikovati med dvema ravnema: državnim/formalnim nivojem, ki mora migrantom sprva ponuditi občutek varnosti in jih usmerjati pri organizaciji njihovega življenja z vidika formalnosti; ter neformalnim nivojem družbenih stikov in socializacije, kjer se posameznik lahko svobodno giblje in sprejema odločitve. Vsi ti koraki so potrebni, saj če se migranti počutijo negotovo in so se prisiljeni skrivati, bo to oviralo njihovo integracijo. Pri tem je sodelovanje večine prebivalstva tudi pogoj za učinkovite politike integracije.

Pojem "ranljive skupine" je bil problematiziran, saj morda ne bodo vsem enako ustrezale iste metode in dejavnosti integracije: nekatere stvari bodo delovale za nekatere, za druge pa ne. Vprašanje je, kako doseči različne uporabnike in doseči napredek uporabnika/migranta. Cilj je avtonomija "ranljivih" skupin, tako da lahko ljudje končno nadaljujejo sami z metodami, ki njim najbolj ustrezajo.

Jezik

Jezikovne politike so bile izpostavljene kot neučinkovite zaradi velikih skupin z veliko udeleženci, ki prihajajo iz različnih delov sveta in imajo različno izobrazbeno podlago (nekateri so tudi nepismeni) in zato ne morejo slediti istemu pouku v istem tempu. Prvi cilj bi moral biti usvojitev vsakdanje/pogovorne slovenščine, kar je pomembno. Intervjuvanka, ki tekoče govori tri jezike in se sedaj uči slovenščine, je dejala: *"Jezik bi moral biti poučevan resnično drugače. Ne vem, toda kolikor vidim, vsi migranti, ki jih poznam, zelo redko govorijo tekoče slovensko in tukaj so že leta. In to je res moteče. /.../ to zahteva zelo dobro zasnovan učni program. Še posebej te spletne zadeve." (AL.)*

Prav tako bi zaradi pomanjkanja prevajalcev in medkulturnih mediatorjev migranti morali imeti na voljo medkulturnega mediatorja na več področjih (zdravstvo, socialno varstvo, izobraževanje, dostop do javnih storitev). Na primer, ena vrsta Nacionalne poklicne kvalifikacije (NPK), ki potrjuje neformalno znanje in spretnosti, je tudi "medkulturni mediator" (za določen jezik, npr. albanski), ki v Sloveniji obstaja šele kratek čas in bi ga bilo potrebno zelo oglaševati. Več udeležencev fokusnih skupin in tudi intervjuvancev je poudarilo pomen teh medkulturnih mediatorjev: *"Medkulturni mediatorji so zelo potrebni. /.../ na vsakem mestu, s katerim so migranti v stiku, tista oblast ali tisti kraj potrebuje, morda ne polni delovni čas na začetku, vendar vsaj polovični delovni čas ali vsaj pogodbeno, osebo, ki dejansko lahko pride tja ob njihovem terminu. /.../ oblasti potrebujejo /to/, mislim, da so odgovorne za zaposlovanje teh ljudi, ali celo njihovo usposabljanje." (F.)*

Kampanje za osveščanje večinskega prebivalstva in strokovnjakov

Številni udeleženci fokusnih skupin so predlagali osveščanje javnosti na eni strani in posebnih strokovnjakov, ki se ukvarjajo z migranti, na drugi strani: *"Ampak ljudje se obračajo stran - zato bi morali poučiti ljudi okoli nas, da sprejmejo razlike."*

Odnos večinskega prebivalstva v Sloveniji/Ljubljani do migrantov je bil večkrat omenjen: *"Problem je mentaliteta Slovencev, ker se priseljence obravnava kot nujno zlo, nekaj, kar bo minilo."*

Vendar: *"tudi oni se morajo naučiti. Morali bi imeti neko vrsto programa, da se otroci v šoli naučijo, da so tujci, migranti, normalni ljudje kot oni, da niso drugačni. Morda bi pomagalo. /.../ Da tudi razumejo, kaj in zakaj se dogaja, da prenehajo razmišljati, da jemljemo denar od države, in da (razumejo), da smo tukaj zaradi vojne ali druge situacije. Morda bi jim to pomagalo razmišljati drugače, razumeti, zakaj smo tukaj."* (FR.)

Potrebno je tudi osveščanje učiteljev, vzgojiteljev: *"Dostikrat si predstavljam, da sami učenci ali dijaki v šolah niso problem, mogoče ciljna skupina srednje starejše prebivalstvo, ki ni imelo teh izkušenj."* (AN.)

Zaposleni v šoli je predlagal, da bi lahko učencem in učiteljem koristili *"dobri filmi, knjige, če jih beremo ali ne, mogoče kakšni plakati, napisi, /.../ mogoče tile poletni festivali pomagajo Ljubljančanom, da vidimo, vse te kulture iz drugega sveta /.../ ker se še vedno bojimo. /.../ Krajši dokumentarci, /.../ konkretne delavnice, predstavitev migrantov /.../ recimo, da pride nekdo in pove zgodbo. Kakorkoli smo na fantovski šoli, vem, da so ob takih zgodbah tudi fantje zelo čustveni, znajo to sprejeti. /.../ Gradivo je treba kar dobro pripraviti, pa veliko argumentov. Sam šolski sistem se najbrž v to ne bo, ne vem koliko, šel ... Če boste vi kaj, nevladne organizacije so zelo koristne."* (AN.)

Poudarjeno je bilo tudi, da bi lahko šole odigrale aktivno vlogo pri osveščanju: *"Šole so pomembne", so dejali udeleženci, "moramo se osredotočiti na otroke, nove generacije"; "iti v šole, govoriti z učenci". "Šole so zdaj raznolike, učenci prihajajo iz različnih krajev, morajo razumeti, da bi morali sprejeti raznolikost." "Učiteljem moramo pomagati pri delu z otroki. Sicer bo trajalo, vendar osredotočiti se na mlajšo generacijo je bolje."*

"Šola mora biti pa tudi kot vmesni člen med lokalno skupnostjo oziroma kot neki osrednji element lokalne skupnosti in hkrati nek podaljšek tega izobraževalnega sistema države, mora biti tudi dobra praksa oz. dober zgled. To sem vedno govorila, tudi ko se pogovarjamo z učitelji ali pa z vodstvom šol, da če šola ne more pokazati, kakšno raznolikost imamo v družbi med svojimi lastnimi zaposlenimi, potem imamo res velik problem." (M.)

Poleg tega bi bilo treba spodbujati dvojezičnost otrok med njihovim odraščanjem.

Govorjenje tujega jezika v eni državi je izziv, a tudi prednost. Vendar imajo šole svoje omejitve in ne morejo prevzeti dolžnosti države: *"Se mi zdi, da pa še vseeno premalo delamo na tem predvsem sistemsko, saj veš, da na ravni države nimamo antirasistične strategije niti antidiskriminacijske, tako da pričakovati, da bodo šole tisti proaktivni element, ki bodo te stvari kot neko gonilo naprej ... to ni. To moramo imeti top-down approach vsekakor."* (M.)

Potrebno je tudi organizirati osveščanje in usposabljanja za zaposlene v različnih drugih javnih institucijah: upravnih enotah, bankah, centrih za socialno delo itd. in za starše na splošno. Otroci pogosto učijo svoje starše in lahko vplivajo na njihove poglede, če so rasistični, ter izpodbijajo rasistična stališča. Poleg tega so nekateri udeleženci opozorili, da je osebnost zasebnih varnostnih podjetij (npr. v azilnem domu) zelo rasistično. Prav tako je pomembno spremeniti naracijo o migrantih v medijih in izboljšati medijsko poročanje – predstaviti dobre prakse, dobre zgodbe, itd. - se oddaljiti od varnostnega diskurza in izobraževati novinarje.

Po drugi strani je potrebno ukrepati tudi v zvezi s strahom splošnega prebivalstva – strah pred neznanim: nasloviti in priznati strahove ljudi. Treba je biti realen in transparenten glede tega. Nekateri ljudje se bojijo in trditev, da je strah ljudi neutemeljen, ne rešuje problema. Nasprotno, povzroča škodo, saj se krepi diskurz skrajne desnice. Prav tako je treba ukrepati glede stereotipov, rasizma in nasilja migrantov samih. Toda to je treba storiti na način, ki ne bo okrepil protimigrantskih argumentov in diskurza skrajne desnice.

Izobraževanje, osveščanje in medkulturni mediatorji so zelo potrebni, saj lokalne skupnosti in celo nevladne organizacije ne vedo, kako pristopiti k zaprtim migrantskim skupnostim, s katerimi želijo sodelovati. Omejitve lokalnih skupnosti, npr. občin, so bile prav tako izpostavljene kot problem, saj je vse vodeno od zgoraj navzdol s strani države: *"Ljubljana bi morala biti bolj odprta do tujcev, a ne mislim, da se bo to zgodilo. Ker so glavna dejanja zgoraj, tako je, mislim, da to ni na nižji ravni."* (E.)

Na vprašanje, ali ima Mestna občina Ljubljana politiko proti diskriminaciji, je predstavnica nevladne organizacije odgovorila: *"Ne. Da bi se prav aktivno s tem ukvarjali, se mi zdi, da ne. Če se, se bolj reaktivno, da se kot reakcija odzovejo na nekaj, ne pa da bi bil to nek viden del njihove strategije. Ne. To se mi zdi, da tudi zelo manjka, saj vemo, da Ljubljana vedno bolj postaja neko tako multikulturno sobivanje."* (M.)

Prostori za srečevanje različnih ljudi

Potrebo po odpiranju več prostorov v Ljubljani, kjer se ljudje lahko družijo, so poudarili v več fokusnih skupinah in intervjujih. Omenjene so bile ideje o organizaciji več afriških dogodkov, vabilu Slovcem, da se družijo, plešejo in jedo različno hrano ("hrana je komunikacija"). *"Javni prostori so nasploh potrebni v Sloveniji, še posebej v Ljubljani, ker je populacija migrantov in tujcev v Ljubljani višja. Javni prostori, še posebej tisti, kjer lahko slovenski in tuji ljudje preživijo čas skupaj."* (F.)

V Ljubljani obstajajo taki prostori, ki so odprti in vključujoči, "nekateri so skoraj revolucionarni", zelo pomembni, a ni jih več veliko in izginjajo (kot Metelkova, Rog, PLAC). To so bili alternativni, zasedeni prostori, kjer so aktivisti zavzeli prostor za svoje aktivno sodelovanje in boj za človekove pravice ter enakost/enake možnosti. Vendar, kot je opozoril en udeleženec, "Slovenci vodijo te prostore", kar bi lahko pomenilo, da migranti ne dobijo vodilnih vlog niti na takih mestih. Povzetek tega bi lahko bil, da tudi tisti, ki se ukvarjajo s človekovimi pravicami, bojem proti diskriminaciji in prepoznavanjem potreb migrantov, pogosto delujejo iz položaja privilegiranosti in moči, izključujoč migrante kot subjekte. Zato bi bilo treba začeti več skupnih/skupnostnih projektov.

Skupnostni projekti, ki vključujejo lokalno in migrantsko prebivalstvo

Udeleženci so poudarili potrebo po samo-organiziranih skupinah, da se lahko učijo drug od drugega, pa tudi v povezavi z lokalnimi skupnostmi, da bi prekinili predsodke in se znebili strahu. Da bi to dosegli, so potrebni takšni skupnostni projekti, ki vključujejo večje in različne skupnosti ljudi (lokalno prebivalstvo in migrante), ki jim omogočajo, da se združijo med seboj, se okrepijo in zgradijo socialno mrežo. Omenjeni so bili različni primeri, vključno s športnimi dejavnostmi, poletnimi dejavnostmi/kampi in izleti po Sloveniji, kjer se združujejo mešane skupine, preživljajo čas skupaj, spoznavajo drug drugega in se učijo drug od drugega. Posebno pozornost je treba posvetiti vključevanju žensk, še posebej žensk, ki ne govorijo (tekoče) slovensko ali žensk iz tradicionalno zaprtih migrantskih skupnosti. Treba je ustvariti priložnosti za vključitev žensk v neformalne skupine za namen socializacije. Le ženske in dekleta s trdno podporo se lahko uprejo diskriminaciji, neenakostim ali nasilju.

Mreža mladinskih centrov bi lahko bila primer dobre prakse za vključevanje. V Ljubljani deluje okoli 20 mladinskih centrov, ki jih organizira Mestna občina Ljubljana, Centri za socialno delo ali nevladne organizacije. Vsi so sofinancirani s strani Mestne občine Ljubljana, ki izvaja usposabljanja za mladinske delavce in zaposluje dve psihosocialni delavki (ki delujeta v vseh mladinskih centrih) in nudita specifično pomoč in intervencije. Mladinski centri bi morali biti tista odprta in vključujoča mesta, kjer se vsakdo počuti sprejetega. Udeleženci so se strinjali, da bi morala Mestna občina Ljubljana zaposliti tudi več medkulturnih mediatorjev, ki bi delali v mladinskih centrih in po potrebi hodili tudi v šole. Kljub temu pa je razizem prisoten tudi med mestnimi uradniki: udeležencu, ki sodeluje z mladinskimi centri, je predstavnica občine dejala, naj se osredotoči bolj na "pravo" ljubljansko mladino in posmehljivo komentirala sedanje uporabnike: "Veliko tujcev imate na seznamu udeležencev".

Država, zakonodaja, lokalne institucije in civilna družba morajo biti povezani

Vsi udeleženci in intervjuvanci so poudarili, da je potreben večplasten pristop. Vsi državni sistemi bi se morali povezati, da bi dosegli spremembe v družbi. Potrebna je povezava vseh področij in institucij, ki so vključene v politike integracije in migracij, vključene morajo biti lokalne oblasti in lokalne skupnosti, najpomembnejši pa so migranti sami. Celoten sistem bi moral delovati usklajeno na vseh področjih, kar bi omogočilo boljše delovanje lokalnih skupnosti. To vključuje boj s pravnimi sredstvi, pri čemer se naslavlja diskriminacijo na makro ravni, medtem ko mora pritisk na vlado priti s strani civilne družbe – nevladnih organizacij.

"Večsektorski program ali vrsta intervencije /.../ moralo bi biti kot so-delovanje, in to bi moralo biti bolj sistematično, da se lahko izvaja na podlagi ugotovitev, ki izhajajo iz opravljenih raziskav ali česa podobnega. In moralo bi priti tudi od migrantov. /.../ morali bi nas poslušati in slišati, kaj se dogaja na terenu" (AL.).

5. Zaključek

Čeprav Slovenija še ni sprejela akcijskega načrta proti rasizmu, se lahko naredijo koraki, da se vsaj na nekaterih lokalnih ravneh doseže ta cilj. Ljubljana kot glavno mesto z največjim številom migrantov in izkušnjami raznolikosti bi morala prevzeti to vodilno vlogo. Zaradi naših obsežnih izkušenj in raziskav smo se odločili sodelovati z Mestno občino Ljubljana in oblikovati ustrezen dokument za boj proti rasizmu. Kot nakazuje to poročilo, je še veliko dela, vendar obstajajo tudi številne priložnosti za boj proti rasizmu in diskriminaciji na lokalni ravni.

Na področju (vključujočega) izobraževanja je **Osnovna šola Livada**¹¹ primer dobre prakse pri uspešnem vključevanju migrantov. Okoli 90% učencev te šole so tuji državljani, ki govorijo okoli 30 jezikov. Njihov pristop je inovativen in mnoge druge šole se učijo od njih. Ponujajo veliko več kot dodatne ure slovenščine za tuje učence. Delajo na integraciji otrok skozi pripravljalni proces, uvodni in nadaljevalni proces, kjer otroci pridobijo praktične veščine, ki jim pomagajo pri vključevanju v nove skupnosti. Po potrebi učenci prejmejo dodatno individualno ali skupinsko podporo, učitelji in šolsko osebje pa se ukvarjajo z izzivi, s katerimi se srečujejo migrantski otroci, od socialne izključenosti, težav pri učenju slovenščine pa tudi pri vključevanju v nove skupnosti.

Na področju športa in vključevanja skupnosti je turnir v nogometu "**Brcnimo rasizem**" lahko prepoznan kot dobra praksa. Druga dobra praksa je **Festival migrantskega filma**,¹² ki ga že od leta 2010 organizira Slovenska filantropija – kot obeležitev svetovnega dneva beguncev (20. junija). Vsako leto ima festival tematsko usmeritev, povezano s politiko azila, migracijami in begunci, in deli mnogo zgodb tistih, ki so bili prisiljeni zapustiti svoje domove, in tistih, ki jih pogosto pozabimo in ne slišimo dovolj.

Ker je v Ljubljani več kot 20 mladinskih centrov, bi ti lahko bili (in bi morali biti) primeri dobre prakse – odprta in vključujoča mesta za vse mlade, ki živijo v Ljubljani. Predstavljamo enega od mladinskih centrov, ki s svojim delom prispeva k boju proti rasizmu: **Mladinski center Bob**¹³ je spodbuden in varen prostor, kjer mladi lahko poglobijo znanje, razvijajo veščine, trenirajo svoje sposobnosti ter vzpostavljajo in krepijo odnose, ki jih drugje ne morejo obogatiti. V največji možni meri so vključeni pri soustvarjanju programa, da bi le-ta ustrezal njihovim trenutnim potrebam. Prav tako je to prostor, kjer mladi dobijo podporo pri razvijanju idej za projekte, razvijanju potencialov in reševanju različnih življenjskih izzivov.

Zavod Afriška vas¹⁴ organizira **festival Afriška VasFest** od leta 2016 s ciljem predstavitve raznolikosti afriških kultur skozi modo, umetnost, šport, kulinarične dobrote in glasbo.

¹¹ <https://www.oslivada.si/>

¹² <https://www.fmf-slovenija.si/en/about-festival/>

¹³ <https://www.zavod-bob.si/blog/project/odprti-bob/>

¹⁴ <https://afriskavas.si/about-us/>

Namen dogodka je razvijati in krepiti duh tolerance in multikulturalizma. Hkrati predstavlja odlično priložnost za povezovanje obiskovalcev z različnimi ozadji.

Seveda obstajajo tudi druge dobre prakse, ki jih je mogoče prepoznati v Ljubljani, kot so različne interaktivne delavnice, ki se ukvarjajo s problematiko rasizma in jih organizirajo nevladne organizacije v šolah; oddaje o migrantih, ki jih vodi Radio študent; občasno zaposleni medkulturni mediatorji pri nevladnih organizacijah itd. Vendar je treba poudariti nujno potrebo po več odprtih in vključujočih skupnostnih prostorih v Ljubljani, več skupnih programov in skupnostnih dogodkov, več kampanj za osveščanje in predvsem celovito strategijo proti rasizmu, ki bi jo sprejela Mestna občina Ljubljana – za izboljšanje življenja in boljše sobivanje migrantov in lokalnega prebivalstva. To bi bil nujen prvi korak k temu, da Ljubljana postane "mesto za vsakogar".

Viri

1. Bajt, V. (2021a) The Virus of Fear: Nationalism and Pandemic Society. Monitor ISH, XXIII(2): 50-77.
2. Bajt, V. (2021b) Zmanjševanje in odpravljanje diskriminacije na podlagi etničnosti, 'rase', nacionalnosti in/ali vere (Reducing and eliminating discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, 'race', nationality and/or religion): Zaključno poročilo. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.
3. Bajt, V. (2023) Ethnic Discrimination: Strategies of Research and Measurement. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
4. Empowering Migrant Voices on Integration and Inclusion Policies – EMVI (2022). Dostopno na: https://www.mirovni-institut.si/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/EMVI_Slovenia-final.pdf
5. Franet National contribution to the Fundamental Rights Report 2023. Slovenia. Dostopno na: https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/frr_2023_slovenia_en.pdf
6. Jalušič, V. and Bajt, V. (2020). A Paradigm Shift Framed by a Crisis: Recent Debates on Immigration and Integration in Six EU Countries. Annales, 30(4), 517–530.
7. Jalušič, V. in Bajt, V. (2021). What are the problems? Reception Communities in the EU Environment. In M.
8. Kazenski zakonik, 20. maj 2008. Dostopno na: <http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=ZAKO5050>
9. Kogovšek Šalomon, N. (2022). "Country report Non-discrimination Transposition and implementation at national level of Council Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78 Slovenia." Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
10. Ladić, M., Bajt, V., Jalušič, V. and Kogovšek Šalomon, N. (2018). National Integration Evaluation Mechanism: Slovenia. Report for 2016. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
11. Ladić, M., Bajt, V. and Jalušič, V. (2020). National Integration Evaluation Mechanism: Slovenia. Report for 2018. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
12. Ladić, M., Thaler, I. and Bajt, V. (2022). National Integration Evaluation Mechanism: Slovenia. Report for 2020-2021. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
13. Lebinger, A. (2022). "Nad sovražni govor medresorsko in s koordinatorjem", Dnevnik, 9 November 2022.
14. Mestna občina Ljubljana (2023). Ljubljana v številkah. Dostopno na: <https://www.ljubljana.si/sl/o-ljubljani/ljubljana-v-stevilkah/>
15. MiCREATE. (2019). Reception communities. State of the art report. Migrant children and communities in a transforming Europe. Koper: ZRS Koper.
16. Protocol No. 12 to the Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (2000). Dostopno na: https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/library_collection_p12_ets177e_eng#:~:text=The%20enjoyment%20of%20any%20right,property%2C%20birth%20or%20other%20status
17. Statistični urad Republike Slovenije – SURS (2021). Prebivalstvo. Dostopno na: <https://www.stat.si/obcine/sl/Theme/Index/PrebivalstvoTujci>
18. SURS (2023). Prebivalstvo 1. april 2023. Dostopno na: <https://www.stat.si/StatWeb/News/Index/11259>
19. Urad vlade Republike Slovenije za oskrbo in integracijo migrantov – UOIM (2023a). Pregled stanja nastanitve na dan 30.10.2023. Dostopno na: <https://www.gov.si/assets/vladne-sluzbe/UOIM/STATISTIKA/Oktober-2023/30.10.2023-podatki-o-osebah-z-mednarodno-za-ito.pdf-correctedByPAVE.pdf>
20. UOIM (2023b). Novo nastanjeni prosilci za mednarodno zaščito v letu 2023 po mesecih. Dostopno na: <https://www.gov.si/assets/vladne-sluzbe/UOIM/STATISTIKA/Mesecne-letne-statistike/Novo-nastanjeni-prosilci-po-mesecih-2023-9.pdf-correctedByPAVE.pdf>
21. Ustava Republike Slovenije, 23. december 1992. Dostopno na: <http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=USTA1>
22. Varuh človekovih pravic (2021). Nacionalno poročilo o stanju človekovih pravic migrantov na mejah. Dostopno na: https://www.varuh-rs.si/fileadmin/user_upload/CENTER_ENHRI/Slovenian-National-Report_SLO.pdf
23. Varuh človekovih pravic (2023). 28. letno poročilo Varuha človekovih pravic Republike Slovenije za leto 2022. Dostopno na: https://www.varuh-rs.si/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/lp/LP_2022/Letno_poroc_ilo_VC_P_RS_za_leto_2022.pdf
24. Zagovornik načela enakosti (2022a). ANNUAL REPORT 2022. OVERVIEW BY PERSONAL GROUNDS, PART TWO. Dostopno na: <https://zagovornik.si/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Annual-Report-2022-%E2%80%93-OVERVIEW-BY-PERSONAL-GROUNDS.pdf>
25. Zagovornik načela enakosti (2022b). ANNUAL REPORT 2022. Systemic Overview. Dostopno na: <https://zagovornik.si/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Annual-Report-2022-Systemic-Overview-4.pdf>
26. Zagovornik načela enakosti (2022c). Priporočilo glede priprave nacionalnih strateških načrtov za varstvo pred diskriminacijo. Dostopno na: <https://zagovornik.si/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Priporocilo-glede-priprave-nacionalnih-strateskih-nacrtov-za-varstvo-pred-diskriminacijo.pdf>

Building Responsible Action for Inclusive Local Communities (CIFER)

National report – Slovenia

Authors:

Veronika Bajt, Ana Frank, Vlasta Jalušič, Maja Ladić

1. Introduction

This report is the first result of the international project City for Everybody - Building Responsible Action for Inclusive Local Communities (CIFER). Its main aim is to address and better understand racism, xenophobia, and intolerance against people with a migrant background in selected cities – Ljubljana, Zagreb, Budapest, Paris, and Malmö – and to develop ideas and policy measures which would bring about a more inclusive environment in those cities, thus making them “cities for everybody”. The main ambition is to reduce both structural and institutional racism while increasing personal responsibility and agency of local officials in administration, of staff in services and educational institutions and make them aware that it is them who can prevent discrimination and bring about more just policies and equal treatment of the most vulnerable groups in migrant population. Moreover, local target groups should become motivated and active in developing and implementing anti-racist and anti-discrimination policies in the long term.

The aim of this national report is to provide knowledge base for further activities, and comprehensive information on problems of racism, xenophobia and intolerance in Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, while paying a special attention to the country’s context regarding migration and discrimination. The report is the result of desk and field research carried out in the framework of CIFER project during its first phase in 2023.

Research approach and report structure

Besides researching how racism, xenophobia and discrimination are addressed by the state and municipal authorities and policies, we also explored awareness among persons with a migrant background about their rights, needs and capabilities to address racism, xenophobia, and discrimination that they do or may experience in Ljubljana. We analysed national legislation, municipal policies, and relevant public institutions’ reports (such as the Advocate of the Principle of Equality, the Ombudsman, and the Supreme State Prosecutor’s Office). We reviewed existing research on the topic as well as national and EU statistical data and resources, previous surveys, and policy reports.

Moreover, we carried out ten interviews with migrants living in the capital, and representatives of local, educational and non-governmental (NGO) community, and conducted four focus group discussions with 30 participants, representing the project’s four target groups. Since CIFER pays special attention to groups at the crossroads of discrimination, we focused especially on young Muslim women, women with low Slovenian language proficiency, and young educated migrant men living in Ljubljana. For recruiting interlocutors, we used our existing networks and contacts established throughout years long research and advocacy work on human rights, anti-discrimination, racism, xenophobia, migration, gender equality etc. (Ladić et al. 2018; 2020; 2022; Bajt et al. 2018; MiCREATE 2019; Jalušič and Bajt 2020; 2021; Bajt 2021a).

In what follows, we first present the overall Slovenian country context and institutional framework of anti-racism and anti-discrimination policies and the context of these measures in the capital of Ljubljana. After that, the analysis of field work with target groups (interviews and focus groups) is conveyed in some of the main thwarted areas of everyday life and institutions of integration in the capital of Ljubljana. Finally, we present the needs that we determined through our research, as well as ideas and opportunities for improvement of life of the target groups in the capital (city for everybody).

How many migrants?

In 2023, there were around 200.000 foreign citizens in Slovenia, which represents 9,1% of the total population. Women represent 51,1% of Slovene citizens and 36,5 % of the foreign citizens in Slovenia (SURS 2023). The largest share of foreigners are still citizens of former Yugoslav republics, followed by citizens of other EU countries (EMVI 2022). Among the foreign citizens there are around 1000 persons with granted international protection (UOIM 2023a) who mainly live in Ljubljana and surrounding towns or villages. This year until September there have been 5346 asylum seekers in Slovenia (UOIM 2023b), however large majority of them left the country within a few days.

The population of Ljubljana is around 300.000 and in 2022 foreign citizens represented 12,7% of them (SURS 2021). Unfortunately, the City of Ljubljana does not collect detailed data regarding its population/inhabitants, thus we do not know what is the share of the population that could be described as migrants or persons with a migrant background. Neither does the City of Ljubljana (2023) publish regular updates on its population on their website. The general awareness about racism and xenophobia is still low, and local authorities lack interest and training on these topics. Lack of knowledge is widespread in the general public but seems to be an issue among policy makers and institutions of legal protection, administrative offices and services. Thus, it comes as no surprise that the City of Ljubljana does not have any particular policies or strategies to combat racism, xenophobia and racist discrimination.

2. Legal and institutional framework of anti-racist and anti-discrimination policies

Equal rights and non-discrimination

The Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia (1992) guarantees to everyone “equal human rights and fundamental freedoms irrespective of national origin, race, sex, language, religion, political, or other conviction, material standing, birth, education, social status, disability, or any other personal circumstance”. The list of personal grounds is open-ended. The Constitution also prohibits incitement to inequality and intolerance. Slovenia ratified all the main international human rights instruments concerning discrimination. Non-discrimination legislation includes the 2016 Protection Against Discrimination Act (PADA), the 2013 Employment Relationship Act, the 2004 Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment of Disabled Persons Act, the 2010 Act on Equal Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities, and the 2007 Freedom of Religion Act.

According to PADA, discrimination is prohibited in all areas of life, including the areas required by the Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) and the Employment Equality Directive (2000/78/EC): race or ethnicity, religion or belief, sexual orientation, age, and disability. Additionally, the national legislation prohibits discrimination on the grounds of gender, language, gender identity or gender expression, social standing, economic situation, and education, and is generally open-ended (clause on “other personal characteristics”). Both, the PADA and the Employment Relationship Act prohibit direct and indirect discrimination, harassment, instructions to discriminate, and victimisation on the grounds of gender, race and ethnicity, religion or belief, sexual orientation, age and disability. The PADA also prohibits discrimination by association, discrimination by assumption and severe forms of discrimination (Kogovšek Šalamon 2022: 7).

Furthermore, discrimination is prohibited by the Criminal Code (CC-1), which defines various crimes connected to violations of the principle of equality, also incriminating anyone who persecutes an individual or an organisation for standing up for equal rights (CC-1 2008).¹⁵ In 2023 the CC-1 was amended with the introduction of hate crime as a mandatory aggravating circumstance that must be considered when sentencing. This means that any crime in which the motive was the personal circumstance of the victim demands a more severe punishment of the perpetrator. This thus applies to the criminal acts committed because of the victim's nationality, race, religion, ethnicity, gender, skin colour, origin, property status, education, social position, political or other beliefs, disability, sexual orientation, or any other personal circumstances.

Slovenia is a signatory to Protocol No. 12 to the Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (2000). The signatories of this protocol undertake in the first paragraph of Article 1 that the enjoyment of every right provided for by law is guaranteed without “discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status”.

Main institutions responsible for protection against racism and discrimination

Advocate of the Principle of Equality was established with the PADA. It is an independent state authority for identification of discrimination that also performs tasks of inspection over the implementation of Antidiscrimination Law. It gives recommendations to the legislator, especially stressing the need for clearer definitions, policy coherence and, since 2018, collects data on cases and assessment of discriminative regulations (Kogovšek Šalamon 2022: 6). Procedure starts on the basis of a complaint by a discriminated person but can also be done ex officio after anonymous or third party reporting on the existence of discrimination (cf. FRA 2023).

Human Rights Ombudsman is another body to which discrimination-related complaints can be filed. It is an independent institution tasked with protecting and promoting human rights, including those related to non-discrimination and equality. Ombudsman's office investigates complaints of discrimination and gives recommendations to public authorities.

The Ministry of Labor, Family, Social Affairs, and Equal Opportunities is particularly responsible for developing policies and regulations to combat discrimination and promote equal opportunities in various aspects of life. Its Equal Opportunities Division is a specialized institution, responsible for promoting gender equality and combating discrimination in Slovenia. Since this report focuses especially on people with a migrant background, the Ministry of the Interior should be mentioned as it coordinates the preparation of two new strategies – a strategy on migration and a strategy on integration of non-EU migrants. In addition, the Government Office for the Support and Integration of Migrants is responsible for carrying out policies designed in the field of migrant integration. However, in practice it deals mainly with persons with international protection and asylum seekers.

Policies, strategic documents, initiatives, and cases of discrimination

No strategic documents on fight against racism, neither at the national nor at the local level, have been adopted in Slovenia. On 15 September 2022 the Advocate recommended that the Government, in line with EU guidelines, adopts four missing strategic plans at the national level, as they are the basis for the advanced measures of protection against

¹⁵ This crime has not yet been successfully prosecuted.

discrimination and the promotion of equal opportunities: a) strategy on gender equality, b) anti-racism action plan, c) strategy on LGBTIQ equality, and d) strategy against antisemitism (Advocate of the Principle of Equality 2022c).

At the end of 2022, the Government announced to form a special interdepartmental working group to combat hate speech and according to the Prime Minister combating hate speech was to be one of priorities in the following six months (Lebinger 2022). Indeed, between March 17 until July 19 Strategic Council for the Prevention of Hate Speech¹⁶, comprising of 19 members, representatives of ministries, state institutions and NGOs, was active. Their work resulted in 57 recommendations to the Government.

In September 2023 the Ministry of the Interior issued two strategic documents: a draft Migration strategy of the Republic of Slovenia¹⁷, and a draft Integration strategy for foreigners who are not citizens of the European union into the cultural, economic and social life of the Republic of Slovenia.¹⁸ The second strategy defines integration policy as covering "the broadest social integration of foreigners into society": the education system from kindergarten onward, assistance in integration into the labour market, measures in the field of social welfare, learning about the cultural characteristics of the local environment, and measures for greater acceptance of foreigners in the local environment. Several areas of this document have drawbacks or represent a basis for further discrimination.¹⁹

There are several cases of discriminatory provisions in laws and procedures that were detected by the equality body. Here, we describe some most pertinent to this report that were elaborated in the Advocate's and Ombudsman's annual reports and elsewhere. The Advocate assessed that Article 8a of the *Labour Market Regulation Act* leads to discriminatory treatment of certain foreigners. To remain in the register of unemployed persons, to which the entitlement to social assistance is linked, only third-country nationals (TCNs) must pass an examination in basic knowledge of Slovene (A1 level) within 12 months. This condition does not apply to citizens of EU, Norway, Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Switzerland. This distinction was based solely on the personal ground of citizenship and there was no justifiable reason for this. Such treatment affects nationals of certain third countries only (Advocate of the Principle of Equality 2022a).

Further, the *Higher Education Act* is discriminatory in the part that stipulates Slovenian citizenship as one of the conditions for admission to subsidized student housing. The Advocate recommended that the Ministry of Higher Education prepares an amendment to the Higher Education Act so that all students with permanent residence in Slovenia, regardless of their citizenship, will be eligible for subsidized housing (ibid).

¹⁶ More information: <https://www.gov.si/zbirke/delovna-teleza/strateski-svet-za-preprecevanje-sovraznega-govora/>

¹⁷ Available at: https://img.rtvsl.si/files/2023/10/06/28_481629736695496724_strategija1.pdf

¹⁸ Available at: https://img.rtvsl.si/files/2023/10/06/28_481629802277634068_strategija2.pdf

¹⁹ Specifically, in employment area all measures are focused on satisfying employer's needs, as they decide about who, from which countries and how can enter Slovenia. The establishment of an INFO point within Employment Offices in Slovenia and abroad in specific target countries (those without visa requirement for entering Slovenia) represents a filter mechanism for the selection of "adequate" migrants already in the country of origin, before entering Slovenia.

In 2022, the Advocate was approached by three women wearing a headscarf. They stated that they were prevented from working in health care. In two cases, the Advocate proposed that the employer change the (discriminatory) practice and enabled them to work with the headscarf. The employer accepted the proposal. In the third case, the individual withdrew her complaint and as a result the Advocate closed the proceeding with a decision to suspend the proceeding (ibid).

Also in 2022, the Human Rights Ombudsman expressed concern about individual provisions of the *Foreigners Act (FA)* and the *International Protection Act (IPA)*, while forwarding a notification to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Migrants.²⁰ The demand to pass an A1 level Slovene language test was introduced in FA as a condition for extension of the temporary residence permit of family members of TCNs which mainly affected family members of migrant workers and refugees.²¹ Moreover, a new condition to apply for permanent residence permit was introduced, namely the passing of an A2 level Slovene language test (Human Rights Ombudsman 2021: 18). However, at the end of October 2023 the FA was amended again and for the temporary residence permit the condition of A1 level was reduced to "the survival level" of the Slovene language, while for the permanent residence permit the condition of A2 remained.²² Amendments to IPA in 2021 also lowered the standards and rights for asylum seekers and beneficiaries of international protection while they reduced the integration period from three to two years, so that the systematic support with integration is only provided for two years after the status recognition. This raised questions "about their impact on the fairness of procedures, and their constitutionality and conformity with EU and international law" (Human Rights Ombudsman 2021: 18).

How many cases of discrimination?

In 2022, the Advocate of the Principle of Equality (2022b) considered a total of 353 discrimination cases. The most frequently alleged personal ground of discrimination in cases completed in 2022 was disability (11.6 %), followed by citizenship (7.1 %), age (6.5 %), gender (6.2 %), and the total number of cases with personal grounds of nationality, race and ethnic origin (5.0 %).

The Ombudsman, according to its 2022 annual report, dealt with a total of 271 cases concerning foreigners, which is 60 % more than in the previous year. In addition, foreigners were also discussed within several other content areas. Most cases were related to the entry, exit and stay of foreigners in the country. Here, the number of complaints almost doubled, whereas in the field of citizenship, the number tripled. Most of the complaints concerned the length of the procedures. In particular, the procedures at the administrative

²⁰ Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2022-04/SloveniaNHRISubmission.pdf>

²¹ If they did not manage to start the family reunification procedure under reduced conditions within 90 days upon status recognition.

²² Available at: <https://www.gov.si/novice/2023-10-18-z-nujino-novelo-zakona-o-tujcih-prilagajamo-pogoj-znanja-slovenskega-jezika/>

units in Ljubljana and Maribor (second biggest city) have repeatedly proven to be too long. On the other hand, no unjustified delay was found in the procedures for the temporary protection of displaced persons from Ukraine (Human Rights Ombudsman 2023).

According to the Franet National contribution to the Fundamental Rights Report 2023 for Slovenia, the police is still one of the rare bodies able to generate some data on offences involving ethnical, racial or religious intolerance motives. In 2022, the police dealt with 18 suspicions of criminal offences motivated by ethnic/racial intolerance and lodged 16 criminal complaints with the competent state prosecutor. They also investigated one alleged criminal offence motivated by religious intolerance but did not lodge the criminal complaint. Data on these incidents, disaggregated by further details or personal grounds are not kept.

Some conclusions

The above-mentioned discrimination cases which were addressed and dealt with by the responsible institutions in fact show how institutionalized hierarchy, often created by law (not only between citizens and foreigners but also among various groups of foreigners) include and perpetuate established post-colonial hierarchies, racial relations, and prejudice. Research on ethnic discrimination (Bajt 2023) shows that, despite existing legal grounds for its prevention, the extent of ethnic and racial discrimination in Slovenia is highly problematic. While the practice of measuring discrimination is almost non-existing, Bajt in her book offers in-depth field investigation of discrimination in several areas of life and attempts to measure (ethnic) discrimination beyond official statistics. Unequal treatment is usually sustained by prejudices that accompany discriminatory practices and do not enable equal treatment. Poor knowledge or lack of understanding of the Slovenian language often represents an obstacle to achieve equal treatment despite formal rights. Discrimination of foreign nationals is common, while many persons born and living in Slovenia are also discriminated simply based on their name, skin colour, ethnicity, religion, or language. The data show that discrimination is most often experienced by persons who are treated as foreigners by the majority population, and it especially strongly affects asylum seekers and refugees. Integration in Slovenia is thus far from being a two-way process and migrants bear most of the burden and simply try to “blend in”. For some, however, that is impossible due to their skin colour or religious clothing such as headscarf. Racialized minorities are for sure most at risk of experiencing discrimination and racism in Slovenia as well as in its capital – Ljubljana.

3. Local practices and experiences

Slovenia is still considered to be a “homogeneous” society, even though it is - as a former republic of Yugoslavia - also multireligious and multiethnic. Yet only members of the Italian and Hungarian minorities enjoy the political status of indigenous minorities, the Roma minority has the status of a special ethnic community, whereas other ethnic groups do not enjoy any special status, but are given some cultural rights (Kogovšek Šalamon 2022). The socioeconomic changes of the last 20 years, during which the circumstances concerning housing, social welfare, health care and education to the large extent deteriorated for most of the population, resulted in even bigger problems for migrant population. The increased immigration in the last 20 years, especially in some bigger cities in Slovenia, resulted in a changed structure of the population, and therefore in the growing need of adaptation of policies, strategies, and practices. In some cities and towns, migrant populations appear as a challenge for local communities which already face a lack of services (and lack of working force) especially in health care and education.

Unfortunately, migrant communities are the first to suffer the negative consequences of these socioeconomic challenges, while they are, time and again, populistically represented as intruders who bear responsibility for general ineffective socioeconomic and political conduct in the country. Moreover, in some local communities, due to lack of institutions, funding and experience, local politicians and inhabitants push for more restrictive legislation and less rights to immigrants, which also influences the general climate of (non)acceptance, necessary for any integration and welcome.

The field of migration and integration in Slovenia is almost entirely in the competence of the state, and local authorities mostly also see it as such. The state in general does not share the integration obligations with local communities nor provides them with knowledge and means for this purpose, even though the integration takes place mostly and above all where people live, thus at the local level. Local policies mostly do not address foreigners’ integration. The 2023 draft integration strategy²³ however foresees some positive measures for integration of migrants at the local level. The first is the involvement of intercultural mediators in all key public institutions and providing the training for them. The second is the development of a model for the transfer of certain integration tasks from the state to the local level. The third is to provide education and training of professionals to work with foreigners, and the fourth is to enable access to not-for-profit rental housing and subsidies for market rents also to migrants.

Various NGOs in Slovenia are engaged in combating racism and discrimination. These organizations often play a crucial role in raising awareness, advocating for policy changes, and providing support to victims of discrimination, xenophobic or racist attacks. Relevant NGOs can be divided in two main groups: A) those focusing on a specific group of people

²³ Available at: https://img.rtvsl.si/files/2023/10/06/28_481629802277634068_strategija2.pdf

(for example, people with physical and intellectual disabilities, LGBTIQ+, migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, specific minorities such as Roma, victims of violence etc.), which usually (not always) also provide support services to these groups; and B) those fighting for human rights and against discrimination in general, mainly working in research and advocacy, taking on a watch-dog role towards the decision-makers, which usually do not work directly with and do not provide direct services to specific groups.

What are the problems?

The main problems that are currently present in Slovenia concerning discrimination based on the personal circumstances of nationality, citizenship, skin colour and religion are in the following areas: access to housing, employment and the workplace, access to services (e.g. banking services and healthcare), and administrative procedures (Bajt 2021b).

A. Housing

One of the most problematic areas where migrants face discrimination is the lack of affordable housing overall in Slovenia. Rents have surged in the past years (especially in Ljubljana), and it is very difficult to afford a suitable residence with average or even lower salaries. Rents in Ljubljana are too high in general, but they are even higher for migrants than for locals. The main additional problem is discrimination on the part of the flat owners, who do not want to rent to migrants in general, especially to third country nationals. If they rent, many flat owners do not give out a tenancy agreement or do not put the actual rent price in the contract to avoid paying taxes (knowing full well that they are in breach of law). Also, contracts (if given) are not long-term, mainly up to a year. Consequently, migrants face instability and are often forced to move, which causes significant distress as they must change kindergartens, schools, doctors, and their entire social network of neighbourhood ties that are crucial for their social integration and well-being and have to start integrating into a new environment again.

“The finding and renting a place is already a nightmare. Even for Slovenians, I understand their situation as well. For foreigners, for migrants, even for refugees this is the hardest. They are searching for years, they are living in very bad places sometimes, and searching, searching, you know. /.../ So it’s hard to live in one place more than a year. Generally, it is because of some reasons that landlord says, you just don’t question, they tell you a reason that I don’t even name it, and then you leave the place.” (F.)²⁴

One of the biggest problems is also that the owners do not allow migrant tenants to register the address as their permanent address (which they need to arrange all other formalities, like residence permit, social support, health insurance, employment contract etc). Searching for an apartment often-times completely preoccupies migrants’ lives and

takes a toll on all other aspects of integration (job, school, language classes, social orientation classes, etc.).

As shown by the existing research (Ladić et al. 2022) and our focus groups and interviews, racism and discrimination in the housing market is by far the most obvious and persistent. The focus groups’ participants stressed that in the real-estate market, migrants are simply unwelcome. Migrants are also excluded from all housing programs at the national and local level – in Ljubljana. Female migrants with children (single mothers) and large families (having more than two children) are in the worst position. It was exposed that women are treated worse than men. Migrants are usually not even invited to see the apartment; thus some NGOs repeatedly call the owners in their name.

“But if someone is new and looking for an apartment (..), this is where people are disappointed, and a few people left Slovenia because of that (..). Housing is very hard in Ljubljana.” (E.)

It is especially difficult for asylum seekers who are first forced to live in unbearable conditions in the asylum home, and then, after obtaining the international protection, must move out of the asylum home within two weeks. Some have been looking for a room for months. Large majority cannot afford to rent an entire apartment, thus those not having families most often live with flatmates.

“We were searching for six months and we couldn’t find. And then we paid everything and everything was arranged and the last signatures that we were going to do and then the lady, a little bit old, she said: “Just for the record, guys, you are not terrorists, right?”. (laughs) This was like a joke, but we were shocked. “No, we are not, are you kidding?”, “No, no I’m not kidding, I’m just asking, you know, you are not bad guys, you are not, right?”. /.../ I mean this is like when they go to the United States, like you apply for the visa, and they ask you “Are you a member of any terrorist organisation?” (F.)

An African man in a focus group mentioned the hidden racism: his real-estate agent said they have something for him and that it’s luck that this owner was not racist; but when this owner saw this man, she said he was “too black!”

Usually, landlords are very explicit in rejecting migrant renters: “Since I also called for advertisements, people openly said that no, they would not deal with terrorists.” (M.); “Of course sometimes you would look for apartment, they look at you and say, ‘oh an African’ or ‘I don’t like this person’.” (D.); “I said I am from Afghanistan, and they replied: ‘Sorry but for Afghans we don’t give the apartment’. And then I asked her why and she said, ‘because it is not a safe country’. I told her that Afghanistan is not a safe country, but I live in Slovenia.” (E.)

²⁴ In order to keep the anonymity of the interviewees we only use the initials of pseudonyms.

B. Employment

In Slovenia no institution collects data on how many migrants are employed. Therefore, a lot of information is missing for an in-depth analysis of this field. Although most categories of migrants do have access to the labour market, it is a question of what kind of jobs they are able to obtain – jobs related to their own profession or any kind of jobs or mainly unskilled physical work. Some might not have documents to prove their profession or official education and it is difficult for them to obtain them. The Slovene language is usually emphasised as the main barrier, while in places where employers need a low paid workforce language is not presented as a problem. NGOs are reporting that in some low paid jobs in factories, where labour involves high risks, employers prefer migrants from Balkan countries, as the languages are more similar, and it is thus easier to communicate with those workers. Migrants with specific qualifications/skills might find employment faster than those without any specific knowledge or expertise. Some of them find work at different NGOs dealing with refugees as translators and similar, while most job-offers they get from the Employment Service are for assistance in the kitchen of restaurants, food deliveries, or other physical and low-paid work in production, construction, industry. There are also “ethnic niches” for employment in restaurants which offer ethnic food. In one of the focus groups an example was given of the owner of a Turkish shop in Ljubljana who is a cardiologist and cannot work in his profession (despite significant lack of doctors in Slovenia), so he opened a food store.

“I think this is racism because from the start they blocked something for us. They are not like other countries to put people in the professional field. So they can finish their study, they go to school and after one guy finishes medicine, he can go (work in a) hospital.” (E.)

Many employers do not understand the legal framework for the employment of migrants/refugees and rather decide to not have “additional problems” with employing them (even though the framework is the same as for nationals). Most migrants are not informed about their rights and the ways how to enforce them, such as annual leave, sick leave, paid overtime etc. In employment, our research participants say, “discrimination is crazy”. They are treated badly not only by Slovenians but also by other “first class” migrants, those who are in Slovenia longer, or those from the former Yugoslav countries. One can also see the differentiation between migrants and “ex-pats”.

In focus groups a case was exposed: when African men arrived at the company where they should start working, the boss was visibly surprised they were black. He told them they would work six days a week, and first two shifts, then later also three shifts – for the same salary as set for working five days a week in only morning shifts. The night shift was harder work and in cold without any uniforms; the boss said they should put on their jackets. At the end it turned out they should only work night shifts, while Slovenians and maybe other workers got to work only in the morning shifts. The participant also mentioned that African men mostly get short-term contracts, for one month or maybe three. If the employment is

so unstable and unsure, they cannot plan their future living from month to month. “If you are not Slovenian you get to do harder work and you get more work.”

“First day they were giving us 8 hours shifts and immediately they changed it into 12 hours. But we get only 8 hours paid. /.../ And then the hard work was for us, and the easy work wasn't for Slovenian but for the white skin. /.../ Sometimes they are asking us: ‘Why do you come here in Slovenia?’ and then if you ask them, they were Macedonian, Bosnian or Croatian, Serbians, but not Slovenian.” (E.)

Most workers in physical and service jobs (restaurants, construction) are foreigners and employers don't respect their rights, they even threaten them by saying: “Do you want a job or your rights?”

Religion or religious expression is frequently ground for discrimination, especially for veiled Muslim women. As exposed in focus groups, no one wants to hire a veiled woman. One migrant woman wanted to enrol in secondary school to become either a kindergarten teacher or a nurse, but she was discouraged from even trying to enrol because of her headscarf - only if she uncovered herself.

“For the working spaces a woman with a headscarf, (..) it's in the level of impossibility. (laughs) So this is kind of a huge problem for Slovenia, no one wants to take the risk of hiring a woman with a headscarf /his friend/ she “applied to many schools /.../ because she had a CV, diploma and everything with a photo, a picture. But she was not with headscarf at that time, and they accepted her. When she went to the school, they asked “Are you the same person? Because you didn't have a headscarf. We would accept you but, is there any other way that you could work without?”. This is a huge problem, especially for women.” (F.)

“I looked for all the jobs, I said that I can also clean, if anyone needs it, and the lady told me “OK, if you are going to work without a headscarf, you can come, at work you put the headscarf down, when you go out then you can put the headscarf on, then you can work”. I said, then I won't work. I told her, I will not clean with a headscarf, I will clean with my hands /.../ I was looking for a job for a year. I didn't put my photo on the CV and I send the CV and they tell me on the phone everything is okay, come to the interview and when I come, when they see that I'm dressed a little differently, and so on, they say no, or that they will call back and they never did. (FR.)

Our interviewees and focus groups participants shared their observation and experience that in Ljubljana, veiled Muslim women only get jobs at some foreign companies/stores (like IKEA and Primark) or specific ethnic shops, cafes or restaurants (like Turkish food stores, Egyptian café, etc.).

In the public sector, there are no covered women in any position (educators, teachers) which also displays the difference between socio-economic class, between male and

female migrants. Employers often do not have any understanding for the needs of migrants. One interviewee recalled how suggestions to employers: *“to have a place – in foreign countries it is called a place for meditation – which is also intended for other faiths, so that they can retreat and have their own religious ceremony in time, because we know that many communities have such ceremonies several times a day. And it was accepted as science fiction. /.../ Anti-discrimination plans that every employer should have, this is still very much in its infancy level here.”* (M.).

Focus group participants and interviewees mentioned that migrants should be employed in state sectors dealing with migrants: *“I think they should allow the foreigners from many countries to work in public offices. /.../ But here in Slovenia, show me where it happened. One person works somewhere? No. /.../ Social workers in asylum centres - they should be from foreigners.”* (E.)

C. Access to services

Health and social security

Access to healthcare depends on one's type of health insurance (only basic or also additional) and which services it covers (this is valid for all residents in Slovenia). The main problem is access to primary healthcare because of lack of general practitioners for citizens and migrants alike. Migrants additionally encounter discrimination and inappropriate attitudes in the health system due to discrimination, prejudices, stereotypes, lack of inter-cultural competence and skills, language barrier, insufficient financial means, and lack of time to deal with each patient (general practitioners only have seven minutes per patient).

Language is a pertinent problem since there are no free interpretation/translation or intercultural mediator services available in the health system. Some NGOs working with refugees have their own intercultural mediators or interpreters that can escort people to medical appointments. However, this is not ensured systematically and not always (especially in medical emergencies). Needs for interpreters are increasing and often children interpret for their parents – at the doctor's, gynaecologist's, social work centres, and administrative units, which is too much of a burden and responsibility for a child and should not be the practice. Language inaccessibility of migrant women is a pressing problem in social and healthcare. A systemic solution is needed.

Foreigners, especially those with visible religious affiliation (e.g. headscarf), expressed the level of discrimination they encounter:

“I had one doctor, but once she told me that she will no longer be here, that I must find another doctor. Then I saw that she was still working there, she only wanted me to find

another doctor, because she does not want to examine me. /.../ My teacher at school helped me – we found many doctors, but when they heard that I was a foreigner, they said that they had no room and that they could not accept me. This is also a problem.” (FR.)

The similar situation applies to social security. The main barrier is complicated paperwork in Slovene language, delays, and long waiting periods. NGOs report that some Centres for Social Work, or individual social workers employed there, are not aware of the rights of migrants (and their statuses and relevant legislation), are ignorant in explanations and sometimes unduly deny applications for social assistance, or deliberately do not make any effort to speak English.

“Some people are reluctant to talk in English, on purpose /.../ My problem was when I applied for this maternity leave. It was one month before and the lady there was refusing to talk any single English word. And I was like ‘okay, but I don't understand what you are saying’. And then I found out that she was on purpose not speaking.” (AL.)

Furthermore, there is a lack of knowledge on the side of migrants on their rights and status, so they need enormous help from volunteers or NGOs to navigate the system, fill out the paperwork, receive interpretation and advocacy services etc.

Banking services

Many migrants often face problems with opening bank accounts in Slovenia – which is an essential condition for receiving a salary or social assistance. There was an attempt by state institutions, such as the Advocate for the Principle of Equality and the Ombudsman, to explain to the banks that this is a form of discrimination and that they are obliged to open the basic account for every person. However, there are still issues in practice. As one migrant worker said:

“I don't understand the system in Slovenia, you leave the person as an asylum seeker, you give him a work permit, but you cannot open a bank account. Which means you don't have power over your banks, then why do you give the work permission? Then what do you recommend for these guys to go to work /.../ you see he didn't get his salary for one month.” (E.)

D. Education and schools

The educational field is among the more responding regarding migrant and refugee integration. According to the legislation, migrant children residing in Slovenia have the right to attend primary school under the same conditions as Slovenian citizens. However, at the upper secondary education level only citizens of other EU Member States, Slovenes without Slovenian citizenship and refugees can enrol under the same conditions as Slovenian citizens. Other TCNs' right to education rests on the principle of reciprocity,

which means based on international treaties, and the Ministry of Education determines the number of enrolment places for these students (MiCREATE, 2019: 85). Awareness-raising about refugees and integration among pupils/students and school staff is done on an ad hoc (projects) basis. The quality of integration practices thus varies and depends on individual schools. Integration of migrant children is thus a big challenge for schools, especially the ones lacking experience. There are of course also good practices such as primary school Livada in Ljubljana.

Children who are enrolled in kindergarten (which is not obligatory) mostly do learn Slovene quickly. Primary school children often do not receive enough Slovene language hours to learn the language and follow the curricula adequately. This is even more so for secondary school children. It depends on schools if they provide additional language classes with the help of teachers or volunteers. Since there are only a few foreign (private) schools in Slovenia, which are also very expensive, migrant children have no choice but to continue schooling in the Slovene language. The same challenge applies at the tertiary level. In Ljubljana, there is only one undergraduate public university programme in English – at the Faculty of Economics.

The problem of not knowing the language in schools is pertinent and this was emphasized by our focus group participants and interviewees. Migrant children need more support and more Slovene language hours before they enrol in school and during the first year or even longer. The problem is the lack of staff and systematic state strategy in this area. Because of this, communication in schools (between school staff and parents) often takes place based on individual initiative, either by the school or by parents who seek for interpreters or translators. Children also often translate for their parents, who do not speak Slovene, and this is a big burden for them and might not be for their own benefit. It can also cause misunderstandings. It might be easier for those parents that speak English, but not necessarily:

“The school teachers in kindergarten, even if they know how to speak English, for the people I helped from Turkey, they didn’t want to talk to them in English. They actually asked to speak Slovene with them. So if they don’t speak Slovene with them they don’t even have a meeting with them, like very important meetings, like for raising a child.” (F.)

In line with existing research (Bajt 2023), it was pointed out by our participants that racism in schools is still pertinent. The problematic attitude of some teachers towards migrant children was mentioned, as well as the attitude of local children and parents towards migrant children and parents. Many examples were given, such as one child bringing presents to the whole class apart from one boy – a refugee from Syria (and the teacher did not react); or a teacher telling a refugee student he is very bad at reading in Slovene language (and unable to improve).

“The teacher told me that my child is not allowed to hug others because their parents don’t allow it. The parents went to the teacher several times and said “we don’t want this child to hug my child”. (FR.)

Racism is pertinent among teaching staff as well: *“professors’ comments. /.../ You’re slow, you’re stupid... it’s still there.” (AN.)* The importance of teachers’ sensitivity and role was stressed: *“I know that a teacher has a very big influence on children. If she is racist, so will the children, if she is good, the children will be good.” (FR.)*

The importance of schools for integration was exposed: *“I think that where the school is doing well, the society is also doing well. As long as the school stands, so will society. It’s just that sometimes, if I can speak more freely, I’m afraid that schools are the last fortresses that offer us security, where students are mostly not exposed to any violence for seven hours, they are under the roof and that’s it. We don’t know about the rest of the day.” (AN.)*

Yet focus groups’ participants also thought that: *“Maybe we expect too much from schools, since schools are government institutions, employees there are often racist.”* An example was given of several phone calls with the principals to offer them education for work with migrant children and the principal responding: *“Luckily we don’t have migrants here”.*

The stigma of clothing, which shows anti-Muslim sentiment, is pressing especially for Muslim women, and some mothers are even ashamed to go to school. Children are ridiculed by their classmates because of their names and clothes. The problem is also the cultural (in)sensitivity of school workers regarding cultural peculiarities. For example, pushing children to eat and drink during Ramadan. Although in such cases the question arose among the participants about “where is the limit of tolerance?” (in a sense should we support fasting during Ramadan for children, who are going to school and must be active all day long?).

Another pertinent issue and a paradox is in the disconnection of institutions and systems. In Ljubljana, there are also undocumented migrants, including women and children. While schools can (and usually do) accept anyone, regardless of documents and thus children can go to school, they are not registered anywhere and formally they do not exist at all (no status, no social security, no healthcare, etc.). An example was given of a girl who finished primary and secondary school in Ljubljana without having any documents, and only before turning 18 she did arrange her legal status and documents, with a lot of difficulty and help of NGOs.

Like the situation of Roma children and the exclusion of the Roma community at all levels (Bajt 2022b), a similar situation is also seen with migrant children and migrant communities. From our focus groups, in Ljubljana, Roma population and their persistent problems are related to widespread institutional disregard, especially in education: Roma children do not go to school, Roma women do not attend school meetings, and both are a problem of Slovenian institutional neglect of Roma population and very racist attitudes towards Roma in institutions. The Centre for Social Work does not report Roma children not attending school, while in the same situation regarding other children, the institutions

would take immediate action. There is a big difference between *enrolling* in a school/ kindergarten and *attending* a school/ kindergarten. Failure to attend classes is not sanctioned. Even though, for example, the City of Ljubljana has organized transportation and provided staff to go look for them door-to-door and bring them to school, Roma children are still not sent to school. Increasing Roma immigration in Ljubljana Brod irregular settlement was also mentioned and the fact that many Roma parents are also illiterate and not fluent in Slovene language.

E. Language learning opportunities & social orientation

Migrants report they do not consider 400 hours of the Slovene language course as sufficient for them to speak fluently. Most of them reach the basic level of A1 or A2. Some would want to continue learning and take an advanced course which is too expensive for them, while the state does not provide further free language courses. People often lack opportunities to practice the Slovene language if they do not have a social network or a job in Slovenia. Those who speak English often continue to communicate in English instead of trying to communicate in the Slovene language.

Orientation programmes are not satisfying the existing needs. They should be implemented systematically, not through short term projects with limited duration, financial and human resources.

Focus groups' participants testify that Slovenians can be rude if one (as a foreigner who wants to live in Slovenia) lacks language knowledge. Language most often "opens doors"; participants mentioned that one must try to speak Slovenian to get nicer response: "Language is the key." One participant, a refugee, was profiled by a police officer at the train station. He started to speak in Slovene language but then missed a word and wanted to switch to English. Immediately, the police officer got angry at him. In the meantime, other people passed and with some Germans the same police officer did speak English. This was an obvious discrimination of refugees by the police. He then asked the policeman why he could speak English with the tourist but not with him.

Focus groups' participants think that it is difficult to learn Slovenian in a short time (as expected) and that courses are not enough. Focus on language is also disturbed by refugees' traumatic experiences: "Can one really mentally focus on learning the language before one gets their family to a safe place?" Some NGO representatives mentioned that learning colloquial/conversational language is doable, especially for men. The problem is that women are mostly at home, while men have jobs and are more active outside. Classes in the afternoon are also a problem for women since they don't have childcare and their partners are mostly at work. The method of conducting the exam to get the proficiency certificate is also a problem: the frontal oral presentation is difficult for many. Many women attended and completed the course but did not acquire enough language knowledge. NGO participants stress that it is better to use an individual approach, teaching one or two women at once, because they learn more.

The problem is also the lack of court interpreters and the fact that migrants and interpreters know each other, which in practice can mean the interpreter's bias – and, as some cases showed, can be a huge problem especially in cases of divorce and/or domestic violence within migrant families.

F. Institutions

Several interviewees, migrants as well as professionals, emphasised that in Ljubljana the migrants mostly experience discrimination from public institutions and when accessing administrative services. In one focus group it was exposed that the system by itself is racist. And if institutions allow racism, how can one expect people to be different? "The state gives people a license to discriminate. If the state does it, then people see they are allowed to do it too."

"Being rude" and "lack of empathy" was mentioned several times in the context of public institutions and their offices: "Everything starts from there you know, every public authority, educational authorities, they have similar attitudes, they don't actually deal with the migrants, or the foreigners. They want them to fix their own problems, they want them to learn the language on their own, without them helping." (F.)

Participants often complained about the procedures, agreed that in Slovenia, bureaucracy is very complicated and that there is lack of common sense in procedures. "Bureaucracy in Slovenia is like a Kafka castle – they (officials) live in their own world and work for themselves." They also said that sometimes they don't know what is worse – a direct attack on a street or to go through this bureaucratic system: "They say: 'Your case is very difficult!' – They (the officials) make it bloody difficult for you" /to arrange any administrative matter/.

One participant said: "I always feel like they look at me in a way as if I want to cheat the system."

Officials also approach unprofessionally, asking: "Why did you come to Slovenia?" Or another participant's experience: "They asked me to withdraw the application, after waiting for years with having no or only few news about the administrative process to get the Slovenian citizenship."

Officials, according to migrants, often withdraw information: "They just say 'I don't know' and don't bother to find the information or ask someone. They don't give you information, advice or instructions as they would give to the other people." And often give comments based on names and family names, like "Oh, you speak very good Slovene" – a comment by an official at the Administrative Unit Ljubljana to a man who was born in Ljubljana and lived his whole life in Ljubljana.

Racist attitudes because of different names and family names were exposed as a direct act of discrimination: *“Če si na -ić, si zanič.”* Meaning if your family name ends with -ić (typical Croatian, Bosniak, Serbian ending of the name) you are good for nothing. Or: *“A to vam je šiptarsko ime?”* Meaning: is your name Albanian? But in a slang, with a very pejorative, racist connotation. This is what a police officer asked our participant during legitimation on the street in the centre of Ljubljana.

Focus groups’ participants pointed out that often, officials do not speak foreign languages (English in particular) or even if they do, they often refuse to speak English. Participants were frustrated: *“Who else comes to the foreigner’s department than foreigners?! How can you work at the foreigner’s department if you don’t speak even one foreign language?”* Officials at the Administrative Units mostly don’t even speak English. *“When it comes to the language it is really a problem. And I don’t know why, oh I know why, because one time in the integration course they told us that this is like a decision made by the government that they should speak in Slovenian.”* (AL.).

According to the participants, racism implies double standards and racial hierarchy is obvious. Institutions treat “new migrants” in a similar way as Roma people, or as Nazism treated Jews. Employees are “classifying people into different boxes” depending on their origins and there is different treatment for different nationalities. Those coming from the East or South of Slovenia are considered as being more of a “problem”. Comments at Administrative Unit Ljubljana showing how employees think of and hierarchize different nationalities/continents and double standards were noticed, especially concerning refugee treatment – for example differences between Ukrainian refugees and all other refugees.

The administrative units treat UK citizens differently after Brexit since they are not part of EU anymore. *“You are British and now after Brexit we will put you in the same box as Africans and Indians”.* This was said by public official at the Administrative Unit Ljubljana when a foreigner applied for Slovenian citizenship. There were also examples of discrimination by other migrants at the administrative unit, for example former Yugoslavian migrants: *“They tell you openly that, unfortunately, there are no Macedonians working at the administrative unit to help you out with their connections.”*

These attitudes also rise the intersectional issue of class among migrants. In one of the focus groups, there was an awareness raising moment between the “poorer” migrants raising awareness of those who would probably be labelled as “ex-pats”. Most migrants, however, did not have the capacity to recognize the system or the state as the main source of racial discrimination; they were mostly looking for “the Other” to be blamed for their disadvantages (other migrants, other refugees, discussing who is more entitled to what, pointing out double standards etc.).

Social-economic situation of a person, class, and wealth also play an important role in racial discrimination. How wealthy one looks, makes a huge difference: *“If you have money, half of your problems are solved.”* *“It affects the way people accept you or tolerate you; people look differently at “poor” immigrants. If you dress nicer, people look at you differently.”* One participant mentioned this occurs to him many times: *“People often think I’m an Arab; they don’t realize I’m from Brazil, and as soon as they realize this, they treat me better (still not good, but better).”* When crossing Slovenian borders, he said that police officers always comment on how much they like Brazil and football and so on – thus making him “an exotic” migrant.

Appearance is a very important element of how one would be treated. People judge and imagine things based on one’s appearance (wealthy-poor, dark-skinned/black, veiled). *“You are always visible, so visibility already comes with a lot of responsibility in the society. /.../ Slovene people are very rigid about their lifestyle, about their rules - from the trash to the traffic, everything. Even if the Slovene people sometimes don’t do that, but they require from every different people to obey every rule better than they do.”* (F.)

“Discrimination that is unseen, it is not a direct one, but you can feel it, the unseen discrimination is the real problem, because when it is seen, you can react, you can take an action, you can report, you can complain. But the unseen one, it is very hard. And usually, it can come also from people who have authority, they have some kind of decision making.” (AL.).

The assumption of the absence of racism in Slovenia causes even more difficulties in recognizing and fighting it, for migrants and perpetrators alike. An NGO activist expressed: *“People very easily say that there is no racism in our country, which I even experienced during the training of labour inspectors who said ‘we cannot talk about racism, if we have 100 black people’. /.../. This denial, or rather not only denial, but even perhaps this second part of a benevolent response to it, saying no, because we are all the same, because the colour of the skin does not matter, but this is also an extension of racism. By doing this, you are making this fight for rights impossible at all, if you say, because everything is fine, because there is nothing wrong, I don’t see colour. This is their most beautiful response, that we are all neutral. (M.)”*

The same interviewee shared an important message: *“We cannot pretend that we are not the inheritors of these racist worldviews that have shaped the power situation in which we still live. Our biggest problem is that these things are not said out loud, that they are not acknowledged. First, we must make right the wrongs of history. /.../ This is an example of the rootedness of these prejudices towards a certain continent, say. And we can’t pretend that it doesn’t promote certain racist views of the world, some inferiority of someone else who doesn’t have the colour of your skin. (M.)”*

G. Public Spaces

Racism and xenophobia seem to be very deeply present in Slovenian society. They are filled through various stereotypes that guide people in interactions with foreigners/migrants. There are many migrants in Slovenia (around 200,000) and many tourists. In Ljubljana, participants and interviewees mentioned the double standards: tourists are very welcome, but if migrants want to stay, they are not welcome anymore. At the beginning of the focus group, participants thought that there are too many tourists in Ljubljana, but after the debate and some consideration, one of them said: *“If I speak English, they think I am a tourist. So, I try to play a tourist in Ljubljana”*. This way he is treated better. One interviewee said: *“If you are a tourist, it is all good, you are actually the most wanted person in Slovenia. And then you change your status (..) even for the temporaries, okay; but when you are a permanent this is kind of really hard.”* (F.)

Stereotypes about the migrants still dominate general public's opinion and migrant feel it: *“The community feels that we are here just to take their money, and that we are maybe stupid people, we are lazy people, we are not really productive, we are only here to spend their money etc.”* (AL.) One of the teachers said: *“Very simple people, or even when I talk to students, they still see migrants as someone who will take away their jobs. He will have everything paid for, everything will be sent to him. The media also does a lot of good and bad in this area. I think that still quite a lot – in Ljubljana, not so much – village communities are afraid of migrants.”* (AN.)

Migrants often face questions like: *“In which Chinese restaurant do you work?”* This was a question posed by a doctor to a person from Central Asian country, showing a stereotypical image based on her appearance, although she is an anthropologist. Their education is considered as less worthy, or they are not believed that they even have it: *“Do you really have a PhD like we have it here?”* A Brazilian with a PhD in history said he often get this question. Or the example of a Palestinian woman who has master's degree: *“People are asking me ‘oh really?’ They can't even imagine that I studied in English, and I went to a University with a USA program.”*

Several participants mentioned racism in public places in Ljubljana with mostly verbal but also physical attacks. One participant (a man from one Arab country) described a verbal attack on him when waiting for the green light at the crossroad. Yet there was a bystander (a woman) who was embarrassed by this. She addressed the attacked person and said to him that not everybody is like the attacker. Another case was an attack on a woman from Macedonia, who was walking her dog and talking on the phone in Macedonian language. A man on a bicycle heard her, stopped, and spat on the floor in front of her. This happened in front of a kindergarten. There were some other people around who witnessed the event, and they all gave this man judging looks, but no-one intervened.

Racism in public places is particularly pitted against veiled Muslim women. When two women wearing hijab asked the driver if a specific bus was going to Ljubljana, he

answered 'NO' and drove the bus, indeed, to Ljubljana. A participant also mentioned that the seat next to her on the bus remains empty, as the locals (especially adults) seem not wanting to sit next to a veiled woman. Also, often when she sits down next to someone, that person immediately gets up.

There was also an account of a woman who was slapped on the playground in front of the children, by another (Slovenian) woman, because of her headwear. Effects of racism are also evident in the relationships among children and its effects on children. While walking in the park, a family met their children's schoolmate with whom they play in school. In the park, the schoolmate was also with his family, but he pretended not knowing his schoolmate. The child asked the mother how come that he does not even look at him? It was difficult for her to explain to her children that, obviously, the parents of his schoolmate told him to not talk to her children. Also, the neighbours, *“they don't talk to us, they talk to everyone except me. /.../ they told another friend, a third one, to tell X (child) to never ring the bell of their apartment to ask for X (child), otherwise his father will punish him.”* (AL.)

Migrants are also exposed to the constant surveillance in public spaces and shops. In a furniture store on the way out the security guard stopped a family from the Middle East – and only them, not any other people who were leaving at the same time. The guard asked them what was in their bags, and was even checking the stroller of the baby. The man reacted immediately by pointing out that the guard didn't stop anyone else but them. Their children were confused and were asking what is going on. Also police ethnic and racial profiling (Bajt 2022b) in public spaces was mentioned several times. Police officers are stopping differently looking (especially dark-skin) people on the street, checking their documents – apparently especially men.

H. Anti-racism: self-defence, reporting, and bystander's reactions

Almost all the participants stated that themselves or people they know, almost never report these actions. They don't believe that reporting will improve anything; usually nothing happens; they don't believe it's worth it. They cannot prove discrimination if it is one on one situation. *“I didn't /report/ because I know it won't help. I know when this happens to a lot of friends and they tried to do something, but nothing came of it. No result. It won't help.”* (FR.)

An NGO professional stated: *“there is no response, so this is acceptable. Acceptable conduct, acceptable speech, acceptable behaviour and that is what the problem is.”* (M.). Another interviewee said: *“while I was taking my baby with the stroller on the bus the driver closed the door while she was in the middle, so she was about to fall down. And she was really at risk and I was like ‘what's this shit yeah’ and she was screaming /.../ No one intervened in any case, no.”* (AL.)

Another veiled Muslim woman was walking with her children in the center of Ljubljana, when a local woman started shouting at her: *“Go back to your country, leave Slovenia,*

leave the money, you are here for social welfare, child benefits!" (FR.) There were many people around them, yet no one intervened.

However, focus groups' participants also mentioned the necessity of empowerment and that *"migrants have to stand up for themselves!"* especially in the light that no one or very few stand for them. When a female participant was attacked by another woman on the street for wearing hijab, she expressed her satisfaction with the fact that she reacted and defended herself. She believes it is important that people defend themselves and fight back if exposed to racial discrimination. Language can be a problem, but she experienced that one can still react: *"I did it in Arabic, and it worked well. She understood. And other people have been watching and they understood as well."*

Not all share the same resilience, as they might be afraid of reactions, have bad experiences, traumas etc. An example given was a physical attack on the bus: a woman was hitting another woman on her head because she was wearing hijab. Yet the victim didn't react, didn't defend herself. And others just stood by. Victims need to be empowered to be able to react to the racist attacks.

4. Needs, limitations, and opportunities: What should and could be done to make Ljubljana the "City for Everybody"?

In this last part, the results of the fieldwork in terms of recommendations for changes, improvements at the institutional level, and ideas how to prevent and respond to racism, xenophobia, intolerance, and discrimination in Ljubljana, are presented. Moreover, the NGOs experiences and dilemmas are unfolded. The recommendations, mainly in the areas of housing, employment, access to services, and active involvement of migrants in shaping their opportunities at the local level, were created through a participatory focus group approach, and were mostly shaped by the members of focus groups themselves.

Migrants (especially in their first months, and after the status recognition) face severe existential problems so they often do not have the energy or motivation to think about how to be actively engaged in the social surrounding or in civil society. Their engagement is most often organised by NGO activities. They are often actively involved in voluntary work within NGOs, some also creating their own associations. NGOs representatives and experts stress that the responsible institutions consistently ignore NGOs work with migrant population, so they are unable to build a partnership relationship for the benefit of both migrants and the host society. They have the most experience in the field, they work with migrants of various statuses and try to sort out all sorts of problems daily. They have the expertise, and they consistently follow developments nationally and internationally. Therefore, they are very much equipped with the knowledge and experience to put forward ideas for policy and practical changes. Yet they are being ignored. Good practices exist through unreliable/short-term project fundings instead of being systematically implemented.

Questions arise on how to reach specific and sometimes very closed migrant communities (i.e. Albanian) and how to address the patriarchy, which manifests itself on the ground in the work with migrants (i.e. conservative Muslim men with whom some NGOs work). Some NGOs are wondering whether it is right to do this at all? Where is the line between acceptable and unacceptable in non-equal power relations in these communities, especially in relation to gender differences? Is there a limit in democracy and tolerance – that there cannot be any tolerance of violations of constitutional equality and rights? How to ensure constitutional equality in these cases? Should they find it acceptable that women are not allowed to join activities by their husbands or their own migrant communities? How to address the cases of disappearance of little girls/children, who are sold to be married and subjected to human trafficking? FG participants agreed these acts should be reported as a criminal acts and no "cultural differentiation" should be in place.

There was a case of an Albanian girl, a high school student, that our interviewee, a teacher, put forward: *“There was an Albanian student, so to speak excellent. She came to a fellow colleague and asked him if he could give her a correction class. That shook me. Then he says, what do you mean, because you have good grades. She said “as soon as I finish school, I’m going to Albania. Because I was sold”.*” (AN.)

According to participants from migrant communities, the civil society must fight a lot to change things since the state will not initiate anti-racism by itself. NGOs should also create the space for migrants to develop their potential, skills, and capacities as human beings. A participant warned: *“But don’t put us as exotic examples,”* as this represents inverted (benevolent) racism. Some NGOs include migrants in their work and activities. However, one interviewee noticed that some NGOs are still very closed and do not admit migrants into their work: *“The NGOs are the cycle, where there is no way of breaking through that, they just cooperate in between them and the real people who have a problem, like organisation like mine, have difficulty to cooperate with them. /.../ A problem here is that the people who are really concerned are kicked out. Not everyone can write the project. /.../ you find these NGO who are doing this, basically they don’t even cooperate with the migrants they say they work with. So I think this is a fundamental problem that they should solve. That there are too many NGOs in Slovenia but they /.../ are working as a team and the people that is supposed to be collaborating, to really tackle the issue they are not included. /.../ since 2017, when we created our organisation, we always faced a block of NGOs who don’t want to (cooperate) /.../ We try to find different channels, so that /.../ they cannot shut us up anymore. So they are forced somehow to give us a hand, to say, let’s work together and this is what we were looking for, for a long time.”* (D.)

Anti-racist strategy and empowering migrants

Focus groups’ participants and interviewees expressed that the question of power is important and there need to be diverse people in the positions of power. Affirmative action and positive discrimination are necessary. In Slovenia / Ljubljana there is no anti-racist and anti-discrimination strategy, which would be necessary. In addition, and the strategy should support this, migrants themselves need to find a way to become actors of anti-racism in Slovenia and autonomously require changes. Migrant fight should be encouraged parallel to the worker’s fight (or black people’s fight in USA), because the state, NGOs, social services, schools, and local communities can only do one part. Thus, two things were highlighted: the action of the migrants themselves on the one hand, and the inclusive policies and activities of the state and the majority population on the other.

Action should be taken to empower migrants who are in Ljubljana longer time, to be (come) the voice of the newly arrived migrants: *“I am always of the opinion that we can never talk about someone without that person or community. Nothing about us without us.”* (M.). Or as migrant FG participants said: *“no policy on migrants without migrants.”*

FG groups stressed that migrants should also be resilient and resistant in cases of racism. To achieve this, it is necessary to empower or support migrants and teach them how to be resilient. It is also necessary for them to have bystanders as advocates who come to their side (for example on the street) and support them. In this endeavour it is important to distinguish between two levels: the state/formal level, which must initially offer migrants a sense of security and guide them in organising their life formality-wise; and the informal level of social contacts and socialization, where the individual can move freely on his/her own and make choices. All these steps are necessary, otherwise, if migrants feel unsafe and are compelled to hide, this will hinder their integration. In this step, the participation of most of the population is also a condition for effective integration policies.

The talk about the category of "vulnerable groups" was problematized, because not the same methods and activities of integration will necessarily suit everyone: some things will work for some, but not for others. The question is how to reach different users and achieve user/migrant progress. The goal is the autonomy of "vulnerable" groups, so that eventually people can continue on their own with methods that suit them most.

Language

Language policies were exposed as inefficient due to large groups with many participants, who come from different parts of the world and have different educational backgrounds (some are also illiterate) and therefore cannot follow the same class at the same pace. The first goal should be to acquire colloquial/conversational Slovenian, which is important. One interviewee, who fluently speaks three languages and is now learning Slovene, said: *“The language should be taught in a really different way. I don’t know but as far as I see, all the migrants that I know, are very rarely speaking fluent Slovenian and they are here for years. And this is really upsetting. /.../ this needs a very well-designed teaching program. Especially those online things.”* (AL.)

Also, for the shortage and needs of interpreters and intercultural mediators, migrants should be able to have an intercultural mediator at their disposal in several sectors (health, social welfare, education, access to public services). For example, one type of National Vocational Qualification, which is a confirmation of non-formal knowledge and skills, is also "intercultural mediator" (for a specific language, i.e. Albanian), which exists in Slovenia only since recently, and could be promoted widely. Several FG participants and also interviewees emphasized the importance of intercultural mediators: *“Intercultural mediators are very needed. /.../ in any space that migrants are in touch, that authority or the place need, not maybe full time for the beginning but at least part time, or at least with a contract, a person who can actually come there for their appointment at that time. /.../ the authorities need /to be/, I think responsible for finding these people, or even training them.”* (F.)

Awareness-raising campaigns for the majority population and professionals

Many focus groups' participants proposed awareness-raising of the general public on one side and of specific professionals dealing with migrants on the other side: *"But people look away – that's why we should teach the people around us to accept differences."*

The attitude of the majority population in Slovenia/Ljubljana towards migrants was mentioned several times: *"The problem is the mentality of Slovenes, since immigrants are considered a necessary evil, something that will pass."*

Yet: *"they have to learn too. They should have some kind of program, that children learn in school, that foreigners, migrants, are normal people like them, that they are not different. Maybe it would help. /.../ That they also understand what and why it is happening, that they stop thinking that we are taking money from the state, and that (they understand) we are here because of a war or another situation. Maybe that would help them to think differently, to understand why we are here."* (FR.)

Awareness raising for teachers, educators is needed as well: *"I often imagine that the students themselves are not the problem, perhaps the target group is the middle-aged population who have not had these experiences."* (AN.)

A school employee suggested that students and teachers could benefit from *"good films, books, maybe some posters, inscriptions, /.../ maybe these summer festivals would help the people of Ljubljana, let's see all these cultures from another world /.../ because we're still afraid. /.../ Shorter documentaries, /.../ specific workshops, presentation of migrants /.../ let's say someone comes along and tells the story. Even though we are at a boys' school, I know that the boys are also very emotional when hearing such stories, they know how to accept it. /.../ The material must be prepared quite well, but there are many arguments. The school system itself probably won't go into it... If you do, NGOs are very useful"*. (AN.)

It was also exposed that schools could take an active role in awareness raising activities: *"Schools are important",* said participants, *"we have to focus on kids, new generations"; "going to schools, talking to students". "Schools are now diverse, students are from many places, they have to understand we should accept diversity." "We need to help teachers to work with kids. It will take time, but to focus on young generation is better."*

"The school must also act as an intermediate link between the local community or as a central element of the local community and at the same time as an extension of the educational system of the country, it must also be a good practice or a good example. I've always said this, even when we talk to teachers or school management, that if a school can't show what kind of diversity we have in society among our own employees, then we really have a big problem." (M.)

It would also be necessary to promote bilingualism of children during their growing up period. Speaking a foreign language in one country is a challenge but also an advantage. However, schools have their limitations too and cannot take over state's duties: *"It seems to me that we still do not work enough on this, especially systemically, as you know that at the national level we do not have an anti-racist strategy or an anti-discrimination one, so to expect schools to be the proactive element that will drive these things forward... it's not. We must have a top-down approach to this."* (M.)

Awareness-raising and trainings should also be organised for employees of various other public institutions: administrative units, banks, social work centres etc. And for parents in general. Children often teach their parents and can affect their parents' views, if they are racist, and challenge their racist attitudes. Furthermore, some of participants pointed out that staff of private security companies (i.e. in Asylum home) are very racist. Also, it is important to change the narration about migrants in the media and to improve the media reporting – to present good practices, good stories, etc. – to shift away from the security discourse and educate journalists.

On the other side there is also a need to deal with the fear of the general population – fear of the unknown: to address and acknowledge people's fears. One needs to be realistic and transparent about this. Some people are afraid and saying that people's fear is unjustified does not solve the problem. On the contrary, damage is being done, as far-right discourses are being strengthened. One should also deal with the stereotypes, racism, and violence of the migrants themselves. But this has to be done in a way not to strengthen the anti-migrant arguments and discourses of the extreme right.

Education, awareness raising, and intercultural mediators are very much needed, as local communities and even NGOs don't know how to reach out to the closed migrant communities they want to work with. The limitations of local communities i.e. municipalities have also been exposed as a problem, since everything is directed top-down from the state level: *"Ljubljana would need to be more open towards foreigners, but I don't think that this will happen. Because the main actions are from upstairs, it is like that I don't think this is small level."* (E.)

When asked whether the City of Ljubljana has anti-discrimination policy, an NGO representative said: *"No. To actively deal with it, I don't think so. If they do, it's more reactive, they're reacting to something, rather than making it a visible part of their strategy. No. It seems to me that this is also very lacking, because we know that Ljubljana is increasingly becoming such a multicultural coexistence."* (M.)

Spaces for different people to meet

The need to open more spaces in Ljubljana where people can have social contacts was emphasised in several focus groups and interviews. Ideas to organize more African events, to invite Slovenians to mingle, dance, and eat different food (*“food is communication”*) were mentioned. *“Public spaces are generally needed in Slovenia, especially in Ljubljana, because the population of migrants and foreigners is higher in Ljubljana. Public spaces, especially that Slovene and foreign people can spend time together.”* (F.).

In Ljubljana, those places that are open and inclusive, *“some are almost revolutionary”*, are very important but they are not many left and are disappearing (like Metelkova, Rog, PLAC). They were alternative, squatted places where activists took the space for their active engagement and fight for human rights and equality/equal opportunities. However, as one participant pointed out *“Slovenians are leading these places”* which could imply that migrants are not given leading roles even in such places. A conclusion could be that even those that engage in human rights, anti-discrimination and recognise migrant needs, often act from a position of privilege and power, excluding migrants as subjects. For this reason, more joint projects should be initiated.

Community projects including local and migrant population

Participants stressed the need for self-organized groups to learn from each other, but also in connection with local communities in order to break prejudice and get rid of the fear. For this to be achieved, we need such community projects that involve larger and different/diverse communities of people (local population and migrants), that give them space to unite with each other, to empower themselves and build a social network. Several examples were mentioned, including sports activities, summer activities/camps and trips around Slovenia, where mixed groups come together, spend time together, get to know each other and learn from each other. Special attention should be paid to inclusion of women, especially women that do not speak Slovenian language (fluently) or women from traditionally closed migrant communities. Opportunities need to be created for women to be included in informal groups for the purpose of socialization. Meeting in women's groups once a week could be a good start to create a social network. Only women and girls with strong support can resist discrimination, inequalities or violence.

The network of youth centres could be an example of good practice for inclusion. There are around 20 youth centres in Ljubljana, which are organized either by the City of Ljubljana, by the Centres for Social Work, or by NGOs. All of them are co-funded by the City of Ljubljana, which carried out trainings for youth workers and employed two psychosocial workers (who work in all youth centres), who offer specific help and interventions. Youth centres could and should be those open and inclusive places where everyone feels accepted. Participants agreed that the City of Ljubljana should also employ several intercultural mediators who would work in youth centres and go also to schools if

necessary. However, racism is present also among the municipal officials: one participant who works with youth centres was told by the representative of the municipality to focus more on “real” Ljubljana youth, mocking current users: *“You have a lot of foreigners on the participants lists”*.

State, legislation, local institutions, and grassroots must be connected

All participants and interviewees stressed that a multifaceted approach is necessary. All state systems should be connected to achieve change in society. Connection of all areas and institutions which are involved in integration and migration policies is needed, local authorities and local communities need to be engaged too, but most important: migrants must have a say. The entire system should work in a coordinated manner in all areas which should enable local communities to function. This includes the struggle by legal means whereby discrimination is addressed at the macro level, while the pressure on the government needs to come from the civil society – NGOs.

“Multisectoral program or kind of intervention /.../ it should be like a collaborative work, and it should be more systematic so it can be done based on any findings coming from research done or something like this. And it should also come from migrant people. /.../ they should listen to us, and they should hear what is going on in the ground” (AL.).

5. Conclusion

While Slovenia did not (yet) adopt an action plan against racism, the steps could be done to achieve this at least on some local levels. Ljubljana as a capital with the densest migrant population and experience of diversity should take the lead. Due to our extensive experience and research we decided to assist the City of Ljubljana and draft such an anti-racist document within CIFER project. As this report shows, there is a lot of work to be done but there are also many opportunities to counter racism and discrimination at the local level.

In the field of (inclusive) education, **The Livada Elementary School**²⁵ is an example of a good practice in successfully integrating migrant children. Around 90% of pupils in this school are foreign citizens, and they speak around 30 languages. Many other schools learn from them. They offer a lot more than extra Slovene language hours to foreign pupils. They work on children's integration through the preparatory, introductory and continuation process, where children learn practical skills which help them integrate in their new communities. If needed, pupils also receive additional individual or group support, and school staff address the challenges migrant children face, from social exclusion, difficulties in learning Slovene language as well as integrating in their new communities.

In the field of sports and community engagement, **Brcnimo rasizem (Lets kick racism)** football tournament can be identified as a good practice. Another good practice is the **Festival of migrant film**²⁶, organized by the Slovene Philanthropy since 2010, to commemorate the World Refugee Day (June 20th). Every year the festival has a thematic focus connected to asylum politics, migration and refugees, sharing many stories of those forced to leave their homes and those who are often forgotten and not heard often enough.

Since there are more than 20 youth centres in Ljubljana, these could and should be examples of good practice - open and inclusive places for all young people living in Ljubljana. We present one of the youth centres which with its youth work contributes to the fight against racism: **The Bob Youth Center**²⁷ is a stimulating and safe environment where young people can consolidate knowledge, develop skills, train their abilities and establish and strengthen relationships that they do not have the opportunity to enrich elsewhere. They are involved in the co-design of the program to the greatest extent possible, so that it meets their current needs. It is also a place where young people get support in developing project ideas, potentials and in dealing with various life challenges.

Zavod Afriška vas (The African village institute)²⁸ organizes the African village festival since 2016 with the aim to showcase a wide range of African cultures through fashion, art,

²⁵ <https://www.oslivada.si/>

²⁶ <https://www.fmf-slovenija.si/en/about-festival/>

²⁷ <https://www.zavod-bob.si/blog/project/odprti-bob/>

²⁸ <https://afriskavas.si/about-us/>

sports, cuisine and music. The purpose of the event is to develop and strengthen the spirit of tolerance and multiculturalism. At the same time, it also represents an excellent opportunity for networking between participants of different backgrounds.

Of course, there are also other good practices that can be identified in Ljubljana, such as various interactive workshops tackling racism organized in schools by NGOs; migrant-led radio shows at Radio student; intercultural mediators employed (occasionally) by NGOs etc. However, what needs to be emphasized again is the urgent need for more open and inclusive community spaces in Ljubljana, more joint community programs and events, more awareness-raising campaigns and most of all a comprehensive anti-racist strategy adopted by the City of Ljubljana – for improvement of life and better co-existence of migrant communities and local population. That would be the necessary first step towards becoming the “city for everybody”.

References

1. Advocate of the Principle of Equality (2022a). ANNUAL REPORT 2022. OVERVIEW BY PERSONAL GROUNDS, PART TWO. Available at: <https://zagovornik.si/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Annual-Report-2022-%E2%80%93-OVERVIEW-BY-PERSONAL-GROUNDS.pdf>.
2. Advocate of the Principle of Equality (2022b). ANNUAL REPORT 2022. Systemic Overview. Available at: <https://zagovornik.si/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Annual-Report-2022-Systemic-Overview-4.pdf>
3. Advocate of the Principle of Equality (2022c). Priporočilo glede priprave nacionalnih strateških načrtov za varstvo pred diskriminacijo. Available at: <https://zagovornik.si/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Priporocilo-glede-priprave-nacionalnih-strateskih-nacrtov-za-varstvo-pred-diskriminacijo.pdf>
4. Bajt, V. (2021a) The Virus of Fear: Nationalism and Pandemic Society. Monitor ISH, XXIII(2): 50-77.
5. Bajt, V. (2021b) Zmanjševanje in odpravljanje diskriminacije na podlagi etničnosti, 'rase', nacionalnosti in/ali vere (Reducing and eliminating discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, 'race', nationality and/or religion): Zaključno poročilo. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.
6. Bajt, V. (2023) Ethnic Discrimination: Strategies of Research and Measurement. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
7. Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia, 23 December 1992. Available at: <http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=USTA1>
8. Criminal Code, 20 May 2008. Available at: <http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=ZAKO5050>
9. Empowering Migrant Voices on Integration and Inclusion Policies – EMVI (2022). Available at: https://www.mirovni-institut.si/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/EMVI_Slovenia_-_final.pdf
10. Franet National contribution to the Fundamental Rights Report 2023. Slovenia. Available at: https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/frr_2023_slovenia_en.pdf
11. Human Rights Ombudsman of the Republic of Slovenia (2021). National Report on the situation of human rights of migrants at the borders. Brussels: ENNHRI. Available at: <https://ennhri.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Slovenian-National-Report.pdf>
12. Human Rights Ombudsman (2023). 28. letno poročilo Varuha človekovih pravic Republike Slovenije za leto 2022. Available at: https://www.varuh-rs.si/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/lp/LP_2022/Letno_porocilo_VC_P_RS_za_leto_2022.pdf
13. Jalušič, V. and Bajt, V. (2020). A Paradigm Shift Framed by a Crisis: Recent Debates on Immigration and Integration in Six EU Countries. *Annales*, 30(4), 517–530.
14. Jalušič, V. and Bajt, V. (2021). What Are the Problems? Reception Communities in the EU Environment. In M.
15. Kogovšek Šalamon, N. (2022). "Country report Non-discrimination Transposition and implementation at national level of Council Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78 Slovenia." Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
16. Ladić, M., Bajt, V., Jalušič, V. and Kogovšek Šalamon, N. (2018). National Integration Evaluation Mechanism: Slovenia. Report for 2016. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
17. Ladić, M., Bajt, V. and Jalušič, V. (2020). National Integration Evaluation Mechanism: Slovenia. Report for 2018. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
18. Ladić, M., Thaler, I. and Bajt, V. (2022). National Integration Evaluation Mechanism: Slovenia. Report for 2020-2021. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
19. Lebinger, A. (2022). "Nad sovražni govor medresorsko in s koordinatorjem", Dnevnik, 9 November 2022.
20. Mestna občina Ljubljana (2023). Ljubljana v številkah. Available at: <https://www.ljubljana.si/sl/o-ljubljani/ljubljana-v-stevilkah/>
21. MiCREATE. (2019). Reception communities. State of the art report. Migrant children and communities in a transforming Europe. Koper: ZRS Koper.
22. Protocol No. 12 to the Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (2000). Available at: https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/library_collection_p12_ets177e_eng#:~:text=The%20enjoyment%20of%20any%20right,property%2C%20birth%20or%20other%20status
23. Statistični urad Republike Slovenije – SURS (2021). Prebivalstvo. Available at: <https://www.stat.si/obcine/si/Theme/Index/PrebivalstvoTujci>
24. SURS (2023). Prebivalstvo 1. april 2023. Available at: <https://www.stat.si/StatWeb/News/Index/11259>
25. Urad vlade Republike Slovenije za oskrbo in integracijo migrantov – UOIM (2023a). Pregled stanja nastanitev na dan 30.10.2023. Available at: <https://www.gov.si/assets/vladne-sluzbe/UOIM/STATISTIKA/Oktober-2023/30.10.2023-podatki-o-osebah-z-mednarodno-za-ito.pdf-correctedByPAVE.pdf>
26. UOIM (2023b). Novo nastanjeni prosilci za mednarodno zaščito v letu 2023 po mesecih. Available at: <https://www.gov.si/assets/vladne-sluzbe/UOIM/STATISTIKA/Mesecne-letne-statistike/Novo-nastanjeni-prosilci-po-mesecih-2023-9.pdf-correctedByPAVE.pdf>