

Hate Speech in Arabic Newspaper Cyber Law

Case Study In Al-Jazeera.Net Daily Newspaper

Muhammad Yunus Anis, Likha Sari Anggredi and Monika Sri Yulianti
Universitas Sebelas Maret
yunus_678@staff.uns.ac.id

Keywords: The Variant Discourses of Hate Speech, Social Legislation, *al-Jazeera.net*.

Abstract: The government has the power to fight the hate speech. But the social power has more powerful than government to reduce the hate speech. Thus, social power is the main factor to solve the problem of hate speech. In the Arabic world, the discourse of hate speech was focused in the religion, social group, and *madzhab* problems. Thus, the aims of this research had been divided into two basic groups, they are: elaborating the variant discourses of hate speech and the social legislation in reducing the hate speech. This research had been used the qualitative method. The data will be analyzed by the descriptive method (describing the structure of language). The implications of the research goals had been focused to reducing the spreading of hatred in journalism through the variants of Arabic discourses. The result of the research had been concluded that the hate speech had been correlated with the three main substances in Arabic discourses, such as: (a) *al-'adā'* (hostility or antagonism), (b) *al-maqat* (hatred), and (c) *al-'ichtiqār* (contempt). This research will investigate two basic problems, (1) the variant discourses of hate speech in Al-Jazeera.net, and (2) the social policy or legislation in reducing the hate speech in Arabic journalism.

1 INTRODUCTION

Hate speech had been spreading massively, especially in the field of politics, religion, and culture. In this case, hate speech was supported by the social media. It had become the interpersonal communication across the globe and borders of the modern era. "Every man may think as he pleases, and say what he thinks". But, the people should remember that hate speech is not free speech. For, example if we talk about a tolerance, the limit of the tolerance is not the tolerance to intolerance; it can against the system and definition of tolerance itself. If we talk about free speech, it cannot be concluded that the limit of free speech is legalization of hate speech itself. Hate speech can be approached from many sides, such as: law, communication, language, and social aspect. In this article, hate speech will be elaborated from the main side of language and social legislation. If we consider hate speech from the side of law, we can make a definition of hate speech as the expression which had the instigation or provocation, and it can make the target groups were in danger and worried. The target of hate speech always comes from the social group (UNESCO, Jubani and Roiha).

In the new modern era, hate speech has some characteristics, based on UNESCO data, such as: (1) *permanence*, the hate speech was taken place in the long period of time, with the different forms, it was spread with many variant kinds of platform, it also was connected each other repeatedly, (2) *itinerancy*, or the power to endure, it means that the contents of hate speech are still being in the other places, with the different names or platforms, although the hate speech had been vanished and completely removed, thus the hate speech still has been enduring, occurring, and continuing, (3) *anonymity/pseudonymity*, we can usually find the form of hate speech is anonymous, it makes the disseminator of hate speech feeling pleasant and comfortable to spreading it widely, so the disseminator does not take risk and consequences, (4) *trans-nationality*, it means that the hate speech can break through the nationality boundaries. If we want to investigate the hate speech from language discourse, we can take a look the definition of hate speech as follow, the term of "hate speech" can be translated into Arabic language as */al-khitābāt al-karahiyyah/ (الخطابات الكراهية)*.¹ Izat had given the definition of hate speech from three main elements below.

خطاب الكراهية : حالة ذهنية تتسم بانفعالات حادة و غير عقلانية
من العدا و المقت و الاحتقار تجاه المجموعة أو الشخص المحرص
ضده.

(‘Izat, 2017:7)

‘Izat also emphasized that hate speech had been correlated with the three main substances in Arabic language, such as: (1) *al-‘adā* (hostility or antagonism), (2) *al-maqat* (hatred), and (3) *al-‘ichtiqār* (contempt). Hate speech has a specific form of provocation and agitation that make people, social group, and social demography in dangerous. The previous research about hate speech in Arabic language which had been done before just focused in pragmatics and discourse analysis (Mazid, 2012). But in the case of material objects of research, the previous research had not elaborated specifically about the comments of the news which had been published in Instagram of Aljazeera. Zahrah (2014) also had been elaborated the Arabic hate speech, but the research from Zahrah just focused into the hate speech in Arab spring media center. Oksanen (2014) pointed the hate speech on facebook about orientation of sex, physical appearance, and ethnicity. Alam (2016) also had elaborated about hate speech comprehensively in *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, this research focused in the implementation of laws about the dominance of India police power to punish someone who uploads the comments containing hatred speech. Karjo (2016) had investigated the hate speech from ADP, a well-known Indonesian musician and artist, the findings show that most of ADP’s tweets use representative speech act and they can be categorized as hate speech because they contain insults to the addressees based on their race, religion, and sexual orientation. This article will make a focus of analysis from the language side dominantly. Although, it cannot be getting loose from the extra-lingual factors (outside the language aspects). Lillian (2007) has concluded that sexist discourse is one kind of hate speech. By looking the substances of hate speech in Arabic language, this article will unlock the problems about how the variant of hate speech in Arabic discourses. Anis (2017) in the previous research had been elaborated the discourse using the units of language related the personality of Imam Al-Ghazali, in this case, the discourse analysis based on the units of language will be elaborated in the Arabic hate speech. This analysis will be started from the units of languages, such as: word, phrase, clause, and sentence. The units of languages were observed from the main data which had been taken from Arabic daily newspaper on line, in this case Al-Jazeera.

2 METHODS

The scientific research always had been started by the accurate plan. This plan, in the field research, appropriated the same logic, because the plan actually a part of instruction constructed logically and systematically. This research had been used the qualitative method. The data will be analyzed by the descriptive method (describing the structure of language). The methods in this research was divided into three basic parts: (1) collecting the data, (2) analysis the data, and (3) reporting the data. Collecting the data had been used the observation method to gain the informations about hate speech in Arabic language, especially in the media on line, al-Jazeera daily newspaper. The reason why this object material was selected because the contents of Al-Jazeera were very famous in Arab world and it can be represented of Middle East opinion to look at the phenomena. This channel also had the controversies associated with Al-Jazeera. While Al-Jazeera has a large audience in the Middle East, the organization and the original Arabic channel in particular have been criticized and involved in a number of controversies. In the present days, the present attempt by the government of Israel to close down Al-Jazeera’s offices in Jerusalem. This research was using the discourse analysis. The data will be analyzed using discourse theory from Halliday (1994). M.A.K Halliday (1994:22) declared three dimensions of (1) field, (2) mode, and (3) tenor to determine the functional variety of a language. These three parameters can gain the context of situation in which language is used and to determine the register or the type of language used in particular situation.

Field of discourse is defined as “the total event, in which the text is functioning, together with the purposive activity of the speaker or writer; it thus includes the subject-matter as one element in it”. The field describes activities and processes that are happening at the time of speech. The analysis of this parameter focuses on the entire situation, e.g. *when a mother talks to her child*. The **Mode** of discourse refers to “the function of the text in the event, including therefore both the channel taken by the language – spoken or written, extempore or prepared – and its [genre], or rhetorical mode, as narrative, didactic, persuasive, ‘phatic communion’ and so on. **Tenor** of discourse (sometimes also referred to as style) describes the people that take part in an event as well as their relationship and statuses. The tenor refers to the type of role interaction, the set of relevant social relations, permanent, and temporary, among the participants involved. The first step in this

research is preparing the data, the unit of language in this research was collected using the deeply observation using the sence of language. The data which had the great validation will be analyzed in the discourse analysis correlated with the hate speech in Arabic language. The data was written up and classified in the certain data cards. The data should gain the adequate size. The second step using in this research is the data analysis. The top step of this research had been used the distributional method and approach to process the main data. The distributional method (also called with “*metode Agih*”, in Bahasa Indonesia) is the method that used the tool determiner from the pertinent language its self. The data had been gained from the certain unit of language. The data was correlated with the variants of hate speech in the Arabic language. For the last step, reporting the data analysis can be presented by written and oral language. This paper is a descriptive qualitative research paper. It describes (1) the variants discourse of hate speech in Al-Jazeera.net, and (2) the social policy or social legislation in reducing the hate speech in Arabic journalism.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the main problems in this research, this part of findings and discussion will be divided into two basic outcomes of the research, they are: (1) describing and investigating the variant discourses of hate speech in Al-Jazeera.net, and (2) recommend the social legislation in reducing the hate speech in Arabic Journalism. Gagliardone (2015:10) had been concluded that the definition of hate speech sometimes becomes elusive term, hard to comprehend, and difficult to describe. But there is a main standard to examine the expression being hate speech or not, hate speech can be identified by approximation through the “degrading” or “dehumanizing” functions that it serves. There are two types of expression which can be identified as hate speech. The first is to the targeted group and functions to dehumanize and diminish members assigned to this group. Another function of hate speech is to let others with similar views know they are not alone, to reinforce a sense of an in-group that is under threat. In this case, it will elaborate about the variants of hate speech from the linguistics side, using the lexicon and discourse analysis.

3.1 The Variant Discourses of Hate Speech in Al-Jazeera.net

‘Izat (2017:9-10) had concluded that the form of hate speech has near connection with the “instigation” or “provocation” (*at-tachrīdh* - التحريض). There are three basic forms of hate speech, they are: (1) the provocation for violence (*التحريض على العنف*), (2) the provocation for hatred/ hostility (*التحريض على العداوة أو الكراهية*), and (3) the provocation for discrimination (*التحريض على التمييز*) to reinforce a sense of an in-group that is under threat. The form of hate speech in the group 1 (provocation for violence) can be looked at from the data 1 below, from aljazeeraarabic (قناة الجزيرة) the daily newspaper, official account of Al-Jazeera news channel (الحساب الرسمي لقناة الجزيرة الاخبارية) (www.aljazeera.net) in the Instagram, there are 4746 posts when the data in this article were being collected, 1.6m followers, and 2 following.

غارت التحالف العربي بقيادة #السعودية على #اليمن تقتل آلاف المدنيين .. أخطاء تقنية أم تجاهل للقانون الإنساني؟ #الجزيرة
Ghārat at-tachāluf al-‘Arabiy biqiyādah #as-Sa‘ūdiyyah ‘alāl-Yaman tuqtalu ālāfu madaniyyiin. akhthā‘a taqniyyah am tajāhul lil-qānūni al-insāniyy? #Al-Jazeera

Arab alliance raids led by #Saudi Arabia on #Yemen kill thousands of civilians.. Technical errors or disregard for humanitarian law?

Data 1 was taken from the caption of the video which had been uploaded by aljazeeraarabi, 6 days ago (August 28, 2017). And there are some comments from this caption, such as:

- (1) adoiri أحفاد أبو جهل
- (2) zahiddeedar كذابين .. هداكم الله يا أصحاب قناة الجزيرة
- (3) hassanak7777 و أيام ما كانت قطر مشتركة لم تقولوا
ذلك يا قناه الراي و الراي الآخر !! يا قناه ماجوره
- (4) mi6013mimi Laknatullo
- (5) oz5w دق دق
- (6) bader73h يا حثاله بقناة أبليس

Data 1 had represented the provocation for violence. The question (*Technical errors or disregard for humanitarian law*) can provoke the readers, in comments into hatred. For example, the comment number (1), from adoiri account, had said “achfād abu Jahal”. The statement of hatred had been used “the grandchild of *Abu Jahal*”. Mazid (2012, 88-89) had been defined that the hatred statement can be supported by the meaning of (immoral and irreligious): *kaafir* (كافر), *murtadd* (مرتد), *shaytaan* (شيطان) and *Iblīs* (ابليس), such as in the comment (6). The other hatred statement such in the comment (2), *kadzābiin*, had been written by zahiddeedar account.

The hatred in Arabic language can be supported by the lexicons having the meaning about (**double faced**), untrue, and dishonest: *munaafiq* (منافق), *firyah* (فريية), *kadhib* (كذب). The comment number (5) such as sneering using the imperative verb /duq/ /duq/ “beat” “hit” and “knock”. The data number (1) can be classified as the provocation of violence because it can made provocation for the readers of the news/caption for doing violence, especially between Yaman and Saudi people. The second group about the provocation for hatred can be found in the data 2 below. We can look at from the news from the Al-Jazeeraarabic in Instagram (August 22nd, 2017) about the photo of the Leader of North Korea, Mr. Kim Jong-Un as follow.

الزعيم الكوري الشمالي كيم جونج أون في جلسة تصوير مع أمناء التنظيم الأساسي للشباب في الجيش الشعبي لبلاده #الجزيرة

North Korean leader Kim Jong-un in a filming session with the secretaries of the youth organization of the People's Army of his country #Al-Jazeera

The comments from some accounts in Al-Jazeera Instagram, such as:

موتو قهر من تركيا @islam_74508 Eng_awwad.73
العظيمة با كلاب الارض

Data 2 had concluded about the provocation for hatred toward the North Korea Leader, one of the comment in this news had been provoked by the hatred to Kim Jong-Un, by using the phrase /kilābul-‘Ardhi/ “dogs of the earth”. Mazid (2012, 88-89) had been described that the meaning of animals can be represented as hatred to someone, the meaning of animal such as: *kilaab* (كلاب), *qiradah wa khanaaziir* (جرذان), *chumaar* (جرذان), *chumaar* (حمار) (donkey). In this case, the hatred statement can be found from the comment of the caption about Kim Jong-Un. This comment was classified into the second group (the provocation of hatred to someone). The third group is about the provocation of discrimination. It usually contained about the provocation against the government (Myanmar). These kinds of hate speech can be found in the data 3 below. From the photo in Instagram of aljazeeraarabic (6 days ago, August 28, 2017).

يحقرون القرى و يقتلون أهلها .. ميانمار تصعد ضد مسلمي #الروهينغا واستمرار موجات النزوح باتجاه #بنغلاديش

They burn the villages and kill their people... Myanmar escalates against the Muslims of the #Rohingyas and continued waves of displacement towards #Bangladesh

The comments from some accounts for this photo, such as:

(1) *حسبنا الله و نعم الوكيل على الظلمة و ali_miska على السكوت على نصرة أخواننا المسلمين*

- (2) *رئيس دولة ميانمار حصلت على جائزة hashemms نوبل من أمريكا من بعد خلق هذا الدمار ضد المسلمين*
- (3) *العييب عيب حكام العرب الدين oughzaz lahcen همهم الوحيد هو تدمير شعوبهم و الابتسامة لعدوهم*
- (4) *الله ينتقم منهم البوذيين الكفار weld_rdayfe*
- (5) *حسبنا الله و نعم الوكيل، اللهم أنتقم من ha93715 الكافرين الظالمين*

Data 3 represented the provocation of discrimination towards the government of Myanmar which had been escalates against the Muslims of the #Rohingyas and continued waves of displacement towards #Bangladesh. Myanmar was blamed as the responsibility of the murder of Rohingya people. It makes the provocation of discrimination towards the government of Myanmar as the main actor in the murder of Rohingya people. The sentence: *They burn the villages and kill their people* has the negative sense if it related to the word /muqta/ ‘death’, ‘murder’, and ‘killing’. This news in aljazeera was becoming the main element to provocation of discrimination. It can be emphasized by looking at the comments under this caption, such as: /‘ala dzulmah/ ‘on the darkness’ in comment (1), Myanmar had been blamed as getting the noble from America government after burning Muslim, in comment (2), /al-‘aib/ ‘blot’, ‘shame’, and ‘defectiveness’ such as in comment (3). The comment (4) and (5) had blamed the Buddhist as kaafir (disbeliever in God). It means that some comments in this case had been classified as the provocation of discrimination.

Discourse analysis of hate speech in Arabic language can be elaborated by the Halliday theory. There are some headlines in the Arabic newspaper that make the people being provoked with the violent, hatred, and discrimination, especially in the themes correlated with the religion and sectarian, such as in the data 4 (was taken from aljazeeraarabic on August 27, 2017) below.

عشرات #الروهينغا قتلوا في حملة لجيش ميانمار .. مسلسل القتل و التعذيب و التهجير مستمر وسط صمت دولي تام

Dozens of Rohingya killers in a Myanmar army campaign. The series of killings, torture and displacement continues amidst international silence (Data 4)

By looking data 4, it can be elaborated from three basic elements of discourse based on Halliday, such as: field, tenor, and mode. Field was correlated with the time when the headline had been published. At this time, there was a conflict between Myanmar and Rohingya, and *Dozens of Rohingya* had been killed by Myanmar. This headline can press out the reader to get the provocation of hatred to Myanmar, because Myanmar was doing murder to the Rohingya people.

The tenor here involves the participants and their relationship. The participant here is the Myanmar government. Relating to the act of murder, this headline, in the data 4, was addressed to many public societies in Arab world. The last element is mode. The text in the data 4 is headline news in Al-Jazeera daily newspaper. The function of this headline was persuasive, in which it tried to persuade the readers (Arab World) to believe what had been written by Al-Ahram daily newspaper.

3.2 The Social Legislation in Reducing the Hate Speech in Arabic Journalism

Brown (2015) had been pointed that there are ten cluster of regulations that constrain uses of hate speech, such as: (1) group defamation, (2) negative stereotyping or stigmatization, (3) the expression of hatred, (4) the incitement to hatred, (5) threats to public order, (6) acts of mass cruelty, violence, or genocide, (7) dignitary crimes or torts, (8) violations of civil or human right, (9) expression oriented hate crimes, and (10) time, place, and manner restrictions. The following five test of speech for journalism in context has been developed by EJM (*Ethical Journalism Network*) advisers and is based upon international standards. It highlights some questions to be asked in the gathering, preparation and dissemination of news and information that will help journalist and editor place what is said and who is saying it in an ethical context.

- The position or status of the speaker; journalist and editors must understand that just because someone says something outrageous that does not make it news. Journalist have to work objectively fairly, they have to examine the context in which it is said and the status and reputation of who is saying it. A rabble-rousing politician who is adept in manipulating an audience should not get media coverage just because they create a negative climate or make unsubstantiated and controversial comments. When people who are not public figures engage in hate speech, it might be wise to ignore them entirely. Freedom of speech is a right for everyone and it is the job of journalist to ensure that everyone has their say, but that does not mean granting a license to lie, or spread malicious gossip or to encourage hostility and violence against any particular group.
- The reach of the speech; journalist also have to consider the frequency and extent of the

communication – is it a short momentary, intemperate burst of invective and hatred, or is it repeated deliberately and continuously?

- The objectives of the speech; as part of reporting process, journalists and editors have a special responsibility to place the speech in its proper context – to disclose and report what are the objectives of the speaker. It is not our intention, to deliberately expose or diminish people with whom we disagree, but careful, ethical reporting always help people better understand the context in which speech is made.
- The content and form of speech; journalist have to judge whether the speech is provocative and direct, in what form it is made, and the style in which it is delivered. There's a world of difference between someone sounding off in the café or the pub and speaking within a small group and a speech made in a public place, before an excitable audience. Journalist should ask themselves: is the speech or expression dangerous? Could it lead to prosecution under the law? Will it incite violence and promote an intensification of hatred towards others?
- The economic, social and political climate; journalist must take into account the public atmosphere at the time the speech is being made. The heat of an election campaign when political groups are challenging each other and jostling for public attention often provides the background for inflammatory comments. Journalists have to judge whether expression is fair, fact-based, and reasonable in the circumstances. It is important for journalists to ask themselves: what is the impact of this on the people immediately affected by the speech? Are they able to absorb the speech in conditions of relative security? Is this expression designed or intended to make matters worse or better? Who is affected negatively by the expression? (Source: Turning the page of Hate Media: The campaign for Tolerance in African Journalism: Hate Speech: A Five Points Test for Journalists: ethicaljournalismnetwork.org/resources/publications/hate-speech).

4 CONCLUSIONS

This research had concluded two basic results, they are: (1) the variant of hate speech in Arabic language based on the units of language, case study in Al-Jazeera.net, and (2) the social legislation in reducing the hate speech in Arabic Journalism. The variant of

hate speech in Arabic can be divided into three basic forms, such as (a) the provocation for violence (التحريض على العنف), (b) the provocation for hatred/hostility (التحريض على العداوة أو الكراهية), and (c) the provocation for discrimination (التحريض على التمييز). These forms had been supported by some vocabularies for constructing hate speech in Arabic discourse.

The dominant contents in Arabic hate speech had been correlated with the religion and sectarian themes. There were many reasons for doing hate speech with the religion and sectarian themes. The social legislation in reducing the hate speech in Arabic Journalism must be done seriously by the government and the social public, especially the journalism, such as: (1) The position or status of the speaker, (2) The reach of the speech, (3) The objectives of the speech, (4) The content and form of speech, (5) The economic, social and political climate. Studying about hate speech is elaborating about the moral ethic. Thus the public should care with moral ethic to share the information. Sharing information politely and having responsibility. In the other hand, the government should make the strong regulation to avoid the spreading of hate speech in social public. Finally, the people can gain the peacefull of life and say NO to Hate Speech, from hate speech to heart speech.

REFERENCES

- Anis, M. Y. 2017. "The Discourse Perspective of Translation In Representing The Concept of Thā'at: Case Study of The Moral Ethic Book Bidāyatul Hidāyah." *KARSA: Journal of Social and Islamic Culture* 25.1, pp. 232-252.
- Alam, I., Roshan L. R., Faizia S. 2016. Free vs hate speech on social media: the Indian perspective. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, Vol. 14 Iss: 4, pp.350 – 363.
- Brown, A. 2015. *Hate Speech Law: A Philosophical Examination*. Routledge: New York.
- Gagliardone, I. et al. 2015. *Countering On Line Hate Speech: UNESCO Series on Internet Freedom*. France: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
- Gelber, K., McNamara, L. 2016. Evidencing the harms of hate speech. *Social Identities*, 22 (3), pp. 324-341.
- Halliday, M., Hasan R. 1994. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- 'Izat, A. 2017. *Khithābat At-Tachrīdh wa Churiyyati-Ta'bir: Al-Chudūd Al-Fāshilah*. Cairo: Association for Freedom of Thought and Expression.
- Jubany, O., Roiha, M. 2015. Backgrounds, Experiences and Responses to Online Hate Speech: A Comparative Cross-Country Analysis. "PRISM – Preventing, Redressing and Inhibiting hate speech in new Media" (www.prismproject.eu).
- Karjo, C. H. 2016. "Identifying Hate Speech in Tweets". Prosiding Seminar Tahunan Linguistik Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (SETALI 2016): Bandung. Page: 81 – 85.
- Lillian, D. L. 2007. "A thorn by any other name: sexist discourse as hate speech". SAGE Publications: Los Angeles. Volume: 18 (6). Page: 719 – 740.
- Oksanen, A., James H., Emma H., Matti N., Pekka R. 2014. Exposure to Online Hate among Young Social Media Users, in M. Nicole Warehime (ed.) *Soul of Society: A Focus on the Lives of Children and Youth (Sociological Studies of Children and Youth, Volume 18)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.253 - 273
- Mazid, B. M. 2012. *HateSpeak in Contemporary Arabic Discourse*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Seglow, J. 2016. Hate Speech, Dignity and Self-Respect. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 19 (5), pp. 1103-1116, volume 21, Issue 10, October 2016, Article number 4, Pages 1799-1816
- Zahrah, W. C. 2014. *Innī Akrahuka: Khithābul-Karāhiyyah wath-thā'fiyyah fi I'lāmir-Rabī' Al-'Arabiy*. Yordania: Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists.