COVERING HATE SPEECH

A GUIDE FOR JOURNALISTS

CI-2024/FEJ/FOEO/1 Rev.

Introduction

Hate speech pollutes public discourse and can result in discrimination and violence. Its online proliferation in private and public communication makes it an urgent problem that cannot be ignored. Intentionally or unwittingly, some news media are producers and distributors of hate speech. But the media also play a major role in moderating and countering hate speech by doing their jobs of reporting the news accurately and in context, and of holding to account powerful actors who peddle intolerance.

What is hate speech?

Hate speech can be understood as any kind of communication (in speech, writing, images or behaviour) that uses pejorative or discriminatory references to attack a person or a group on the basis of who they are – based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, colour, descent, place of origin, gender, sexual orientation, disability or other identity factor. Such expression is often rooted in, and generates, intolerance and hatred. In certain contexts, it can be demeaning, divisive and dangerous.[1]

Hate speech is an abuse of the right to freedom of expression. But in the struggle against hate speech, free speech is not the enemy. The most serious hate campaigns involve suppression of speech, stopping targeted communities from talking back and media from shining a light on hate merchants' activities. Free and independent media, along with other civil and political rights, are an essential defence against efforts to demean and harm vulnerable groups.[2] Journalists must be free to cover and critique political actors and public policies that impinge on people's rights, and to report the consequences of hate speech at the individual, community and societal levels.

But even with the requisite freedom, media can only rise to the challenge if they give it due attention and apply careful judgement. This guide is written for media professionals who want to do so ethically and professionally, guided by universal human rights.

The good news is that most of the required responses can be developed from the journalism profession's established principles and codes of practice. While some journalists are comfortable with the role of agents of change and champions of social justice, many believe in a more detached approach.[3] Their journalism does not need overhaul. It needs orientation: understanding an extremely challenging landscape, locating entry points for impactful reportage, and applying journalism's time-tested tools for covering complex and contentious issues. This way, journalism can contribute to a culture of tolerance that democratic life requires.

This guide explains what may count as hate speech, the harms it may cause, the way it works, and how media gatekeepers and other actors can address it. Many debates around hate speech are about law and regulation. Understanding the law, especially international law, can help journalists when reporting incidents where speakers are accused of hate speech. It can also help them analyse whether existing laws, as written and as applied, comply with international human rights approaches for striking the right balance between freedom of expression and the right to dignity, equality and non-discrimination.

While laws tell us what we can and cannot do, ethics advise what we should or should not do. International human rights law represents the floor, not the ceiling, of the media's ethical obligations. Media professionals already recognize this in the codes of practice that they have voluntarily developed and adopted over many decades. These can serve as foundations for media to develop ethical responses to hate speech.

1 This definition is adapted from United Nations Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech, UN Working Group on Hate Speech, 2019.

2 See: Frank La Rue, 'Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression', Report to the United Nations General Assembly (New York, NY: United Nations, 2012).

3 Thomas Hanitzsch et al., eds., *Worlds of Journalism: Journalistic Cultures Around the Globe* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2019).

Understanding hate speech

There are several complementary definitions of hate speech in circulation today, offered by various international organizations and experts.[4] Although they differ in nuance, there is broad agreement that hate speech is any expression that attacks a group's identity in a way that directly intimidates its members or targets them for intolerance, discrimination and other harms. A fuller definition is found in the UN's 2019 action plan for opposing hate speech (see Box 1). Not all such speech violates international human rights law, which applies a narrow definition to avoid over-restricting people's freedom of expression. However, any speech that matches broader definitions merits serious ethical deliberation.

UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES

Hate speech undermines key foundations for people's individual and collective well-being. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) – whose drafters came together from different regions, legal traditions and cultural backgrounds in response to the atrocities of the Second World War – states in its first line that 'recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.'[5]

This tradition does not see humans as isolated individuals but as social animals. People's group memberships, whether embraced voluntarily or foisted on them, have enormous bearing on their ability to enjoy their rights.[6] Most of these memberships are based on attributes that are hard or impossible to change. They are often connected to people's sense of self-worth and dignity, which means that attacks on these identities can cause harm.

The UDHR opposes discrimination based on people's group identities: everyone is entitled to equal rights 'without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin' and so on. Hate speech, in contrast, declares that certain groups do not belong as equals in society. In its most serious form, it is expressed as a call to action – incitement – urging listeners to inflict harm on the target group.

THE HARMS OF HATE SPEECH

Hate speech can facilitate a range of harms from social exclusion and discrimination to hate crimes and mass violence. Through the centuries, propaganda containing hate speech has supported imperial conquest and settler colonialism. It has provided ideological support for systems of racism, oppression, injustice and violence. It has led to apartheid, enslavement, ethnic cleansing and genocide.[7] Such campaigns persuaded otherwise reasonable and conscientious people that the targeted groups were dangerous or unworthy of equal dignity, justifying dispossession, domination and even mass murder.

In many societies today, everyday forms of discrimination are sustained through ideas that brush aside the affected communities as inferior or not really belonging. While most countries are not on the brink of mass violence, practically all suffer day-to-day discrimination of different kinds, fuelled by unfair representations in media and culture. Online hate speech can intimidate its targets, deterring equal participation in social life.[8] Guarding against hate speech is therefore a universal mission to which all media can contribute.

4 These include standard-setting documents from the Council of Europe and the South African Human Rights Commission.
5 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UN General Assembly Resolution 217A (III), (10 December 1948).
6 Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Lies That Bind: Rethinking Identity* (Profile Books, 2018).
7 Alexander Tsesis, *Destructive Messages: How Hate Speech Paves the Way For Harmful Social Movements* (New York: New York University Press, 2002).
8 The impact of misogynistic hate on women journalists has been reported in Julie Posetti et al., Online Violence Against Women Journalists: A Global Snapshot of Incidence and Impacts (Paris: UNESCO, 2020).

Hate speech in action

HATE SPEECH AS A PROCESS

Media coverage about hate speech often focuses on a provocative utterance, such as a line in a politician's speech, a celebrity's social media post or the message in a cartoon. Such an incident may be newsworthy because of the instant outrage it causes. It may also be a symptom of a wider pattern. However, an isolated comment or remark is not where the action is. The most impactful hate speech consists of multiple, reinforcing messages, disseminated over long periods by different actors, barely noticed until they pick up in frequency and intensity in the run-up to a human rights violation. History shows that calls for genocide tend to be sown on ground that has been tilled and fertilized in earlier cycles of speech, many of which may not have raised alarm bells at the time. The process can be summed up as follows:[9]

1. OTHERING

Individuals are naturally inclined to want to belong to an 'us.'[10] In-groups tend to be defined by reference to out-groups. Such us/them distinctions need not be harmful if the out-groups are recognized as equally entitled to dignity in inclusive societies. Identification with an 'us' can help individuals see beyond their selfish needs and act in pro-social ways. Religious identities, for example, have motivated selfless acts of community service and the advancement of human rights. But us/them thinking is a problem when it is more total and exclusive, and the 'other' is perceived as sharing no common ground, to be treated as an opponent or obstacle.

2. SCAPEGOATING

This is when societal problems are unfairly blamed on an out-group. An in-group may have genuine grievances, such as growing economic insecurity, health crises or disconcerting cultural change. A common tactic of populist politicians is to direct the electorate's resentments at groups with less political clout, such as immigrants.[11] Scapegoating often rides on pre-existing stereotypes about out-groups being untrustworthy or self-serving. It ramps up anecdotes and rumours into conspiracy theories. Although simplistic or outright false, the blame game usually has greater appeal than more accurate and nuanced analyses of social and economic problems. Often spiking in the run-up to elections, scapegoating is hard to regulate without stifling democratic debate.

3. DEHUMANIZATION

Othering gets more dangerous when out-groups are characterized as not being entitled to the same rights because they are less civilized or morally deficient. Comparing groups to animals or uncivilized savages has been part of the ideological toolkit of systems of mass oppression and extreme violence, ranging from colonial rule and enslavement to war and genocide.[12] A common variant is to portray people as alien or not 'really' part of the nation, to justify excluding them from moral consideration. The objectification of women is an even more common practice that serves the same goal of denying a group's equal dignity.

4. THREAT INVERSION

To convince people to inflict harm on a weaker community, hate campaigns try to flip the threat. These messages claim that it is the out-group that is conspiring to oppress and eradicate the in-group, and not the other way round. This tactic, also called 'accusation in a mirror', conjures up existential

9 Adapted from Cees J. Hamelink, *Media and Conflict: Escalating Evil* (Routledge, 2011).
10 See, for example, Geoffrey L. Cohen, *Belonging: The Science of Creating Connection and Bridging Divides* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 2022).
11 See: Tyler Roylance, 'To Find an Authoritarian, Just Follow the Scapegoat', Freedom House, 29 January 2018.
12 Natalie Deffenbaugh, 'De-Dehumanization: Practicing Humanity', *International Committee of the Red Cross, Humanitarian Law & Policy* (blog), 27 June 2024.

threats that require the in-group to rise up in self-defence.[13] The cloak of victimhood also helps the in-group resist criticism. Such threat inversion takes various forms, such as the 'great replacement theory', which claims against evidence that a minority group will dominate the majority if unchecked.[14]

5. CALL TO ACTION

The ultimate step in hate propaganda is a call to violent action, which might take forms ranging from 'lone wolf' attacks and lynchings to genocide. The tipping point may be an event that triggers outrage and fits with the narrative that members of the in-group must act decisively to protect their own loved ones. Once members of the in-group believe that the out-group is fundamentally different, is to blame for their problems, is not entitled to equal rights, and is a mortal threat, hate merchants are ready to trigger violence. Such incitement is a criminal act under international human rights law (see section below). But the earlier stages may be legal.

6. ERASURE, DENIAL AND DISTORTION

The established facts of major human rights abuses against a group are often suppressed or contradicted by perpetrators and their supporters. One practice going back centuries is propaganda claiming that lands seized by colonizers had been devoid of native populations.[15] Dominant groups may even refuse to acknowledge a community's name.[16] Denial is any attempt to negate the established facts of a genocide or atrocity crime. It is prohibited in some jurisdictions, along with the glorification of its perpetrators. In other cases, genocide and atrocity crimes might be distorted as a form of minimization or erasure of responsibility. But such expression often slips through the checks on social media platforms.[17] Although erasures, denials and distortions may not contain extreme language, they can be seen as hate speech in their own right, as they serve no purpose other than to demean the collective memory of communities subjected to crimes against humanity, to slander them as fake victims, to portray killers as role models, and thus to justify continued discrimination, dispossession, and hostility.[18]

HATE SPEECH ACTORS

When skilled journalists investigate serious wrongdoing, from endemic corruption to illegal trafficking and industrial pollution, they do not stop at reporting individual offences, such as a single bribe slipped to a petty official. They attempt the harder work of showing how the system operates, as well as its consequences. They trace connections; they go up the food chain to identify apex predators; they expose flaws in policy and law that allowed these things to happen.

Journalists could use these same skills to investigate hate campaigns. Working with 'hatewatch' civil society organizations and other experts, journalists can show how hate speech is generated and disseminated in their societies. Even if hate actors enjoy impunity, such reports can raise the public's level of political literacy, helping to make citizens more resistant to hate campaigns' multi-layered forms of influence. In some cases, as when commercial entities are engaged to help sell divisive messages, naming and shaming the actors can deter complicity.

13 The term 'accusation in a mirror' was used in the context of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. See: Marcus, Kenneth L., 'Accusation in a Mirror' (2012). Loyola University Chicago Law Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 357–393, 2012, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2020327

14 See: Michael Butter, *The Nature of Conspiracy Theories* (John Wiley & Sons, 2020).

15 See: 'Study on the impacts of the Doctrine of Discovery on indigenous peoples, including mechanisms, processes and instruments of redress', United Nations Economic and Social Council Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, E/C.19/2014/3, 20 February 2014; and Mahmood Mamdani, *Neither Settler nor Native: The Making and Unmaking of Permanent Minorities* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 2020).

16 The Rohingya people have been subject to such erasure. See 'Myanmar: UN human rights chief calls for international criminal investigation of perpetrators of violence against Rohingya', Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 5 December 2017.

17 For example, Holocaust denial and distortion has been found to be prevalent on social media platforms. See: UNESCO/UN, 2022. 'History under attack: Holocaust denial and distortion on social media'.

18 See 'Combating Holocaust and Genocide Denial: Protecting Survivors, Preserving Memory, and Promoting Prevention', policy paper. (The UN Office on Genocide Prevention in collaboration with the Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, June 2022).

Many types of actor are involved in major hate campaigns:[19]

- **POLITICAL LEADERS.** Few sustained hate campaigns exist purely at the grassroots. They usually persist because some elites benefit from them, as a way to mobilize support among in-groups and to terrorize opponents, for example. Some leaders are visibly at the forefront of these campaigns, but most remain in the background. They may occasionally drop hints about where they stand, using language that is vague enough to allow plausible deniability, yet clear enough to excite followers. Their reluctance to condemn and prosecute hate crimes by their followers is perhaps the clearest indication of their motivations.

- **IDEOLOGICAL FORERUNNERS.** These are figures, often from the past, whom a hate movement honours as a spiritual founder or ultimate role model. They are seen to offer a political or religious philosophy or embody an uncompromising strength that is seen as relevant for the present. Adolf Hitler's status in white supremacist movements is an example.

- **INTELLECTUAL RATIONALIZERS.** These opinion shapers are responsible for bringing discriminatory ideas into the mainstream. They may be experts working in think-tanks, academics in universities, spokespersons for political parties or opinion columnists. They have the media savvy and linguistic ability to convey key talking points of hate campaigns in reasonable-sounding terms, normalizing ways of thinking that could open the door to more dangerous ideas.

- **MASS POPULARIZERS.** Politicians, preachers, social media influencers and media personalities lend hate campaigns their charisma and talent to communicate complex ideas simply and in the language of the mass audience. Like political leaders, these actors may be direct beneficiaries of hate campaigns, using divisive rhetoric to gain followers.

- **PROFESSIONAL MARKETERS AND CREATIVE TALENT.** Public relations consultants are known to have been hired by powerful clients to develop 'influence' campaigns that incorporate hate messages.[20] The creation of memes and other viral content is often outsourced to gig workers and small entrepreneurs working in the creative and technology sectors.[21]

CREDIT: KAITLYN BAKER/UNSPLASH

- **MEDIA MOUTHPIECES.** In societies with major hate campaigns, hate mongers have their own media channels. They may also depend on other media that are sympathetic to their cause. These media give airtime to spokespersons and skew their coverage to focus disproportionately on the campaign's core issues, such as illegal immigration. Such media may have owners who are ideologically committed to the goals of the movement. Or, they may be driven mostly by commercial

19 This list draws from Matthew Duss et al., Fear, Inc. 2.0 (Washington, DC: Center for American Progress, 2015); Paul R. Brass, *The Production of Hindu-Muslim Violence in Contemporary India* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003).

20 The best-known case is the Bell Pottinger scandal in South Africa. See: 'The Guptas, Bell Pottinger and the fake news propaganda machine', *Times Live*, 4 September 2017.

21 See: Jonathan Corpus Ong and Ross Tapsell, 'Demystifying Disinformation Shadow Economies: Fake News Work Models in Indonesia and the Philippines', *Asian Journal of Communication* 32, no. 3 (4 May 2022): 251–67.

considerations, believing that cultivating divisions, pandering to insecurities, and scapegoating unpopular minorities is an effective way to build brand loyalty and attract traffic.

- **ONLINE PLATFORMS.** The algorithms of the world's most used social media platforms reward virality and engagement regardless of reliability and quality.[22] They play a major role in information laundering, which like money laundering, mixes the bad with the good.[23] Even platforms with official policies against hate speech are overwhelmed by harmful content that their algorithms curate to play to human weaknesses. Artificial Intelligence is likely to worsen this problem, learning to create, not just curate, content with the same amoral rationality.[24] Private message apps and 'dark' online spaces are especially hospitable to the organizing and mobilizing of hate campaigns, making extreme groups resilient against regulation of more public platforms.[25]

- **GRASSROOTS AGITATORS.** The 'last mile' in the supply chain of hate campaigns is often delegated to activists who are not in the public eye. They are anonymous individuals embedded in the community who can quickly respond to signals from above to activate lynchings, riots and other kinds of violence.

- **ORDINARY CITIZENS.** Hate campaigns usually try to goad ordinary citizens into action and show that public opinion is on their side. The demand side of hate speech is complex, but often has to do with underlying insecurities about economic conditions or rapid social change that have little to do with the identity group being targeted for hate. People's apparent receptiveness to hate speech, however, may be deceptive. In street demonstrations and riots, it is not usual for organizers to bus in mobs-for-hire. Online, inauthentic behaviour is rampant. Volunteers, paid workers and bots – which artificial intelligence helps make more believable – are used to present a picture of overwhelming public opinion that can intimidate target communities and pressure decision-makers to succumb to pressure.

- **LAW ENFORCEMENT.** Police and other authorities play vastly different roles around the world, depending on their levels of professionalism as well as the country's prevailing levels of respect for human rights and rule of law. In some countries, law enforcement agencies are part of the problem. In communal violence or disputes over offensive speech, they side with the power and influence of dominant groups over the rights of weaker communities, either out of expediency or because the police share the majority's prejudices. A good grasp of human rights principles will help media analyse whether law enforcement agencies are acting as they should.

CONTEXTS

The toxicity of hate speech depends not only on its content but also on context. When dealing with this problem, what is said obviously matters: we should take note if it contains statements or ideas that are hostile to a targeted group. But other factors also matter: who is saying it, at whom is it directed, and the when, where, how and why of the expression. All these affect the likelihood of the speech causing harm. This approach is spelled out in the Rabat Plan of Action, which is meant to guide the writing and application of laws against hate speech.[26] Its principles can also help hone editorial judgements. If the content matches the definition of hate speech, media should also consider the following factors:

22 See: Guy Berger et al., Platform Problems and Regulatory Solutions: Findings from a comprehensive review of existing studies and investigations (UNESCO, 2023).

23 See: Adam Klein, Fanaticism, Racism, and Rage Online (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017).

24 See: Lawrence Lessig, 'How AI Could Hack Democracy', TED Talk, February 2024.

25 N. F. Johnson et al., 'Hidden Resilience and Adaptive Dynamics of the Global Online Hate Ecology', *Nature* 573, no. 7773 (September 2019): 261–65, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1494-7.

26 'The Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence' can be downloaded at https://www.ohchr.org/en/freedom-of-expression. A UNESCO video explaining it can be found on YouTube. The Council of Europe has a three-page toolkit based on the Rabat Plan of Action. The Council of Europe has also published a more detailed manual based on the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights: Anne Weber, Manual on Hate Speech (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2009).

Who is speaking?

- **The status of the speaker matters. For example, a leader with a big following can move a large number of people with even subtle hints, while an isolated artist's very direct provocations probably would not have the same effect.**

Who is targeted?

- **'Hateful expression' can hurt the feelings of any person, but it will have a bigger impact on more vulnerable groups unableto answer back or protect themselves from discrimination and violence, or already suffering from significant discrimination and violence.**

How is it spread?

- **The more public and viral, the more troubling the hate speech. The media should not inadvertently add to its reach. Reporting an isolated, semi-public remark will multiply its audience. Editors must consider whether the benefits of added publicity outweigh the costs.**

When will it have an impact?

- **Legal intervention is needed most when the speech is likely to cause direct and immediate harm. The media, too, should be especially careful about hate speech that incites imminent action.**

Why is it being articulated and spread?

- **Advocacy and incitement, by definition, are deliberate. However, people may repeat and spread hate speech for a mix of reasons, sometimes out of ignorance and without intending harm. Treating intentionally and unintentionally harmful speech as equivalent can backfire by contributing to polarization.**

Regulatory responses

HATE SPEECH LAWS

International human rights law provides a framework for states to deal with hate speech while respecting freedom of expression as a fundamental right. The core treaty here is the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).[27] Regional human rights mechanisms in the Americas and Europe, and the constitutions of most liberal democracies, are broadly consistent with the ICCPR. For convenience, we'll call this the human rights approach. You will often hear that there is no consensus definition of hate speech, and that there remains disagreement even within and among liberal democracies over what kinds of speech should be *legally* restricted. These debates are at the margins (as will be discussed later). At the core, there are clear principles on how to deal with hate speech in a manner consistent with human rights.

To strike a balance between the right to free expression and the right to equality, dignity and non-discrimination, the human rights approach recognizes three levels of problematic expression, each of which requires different legal treatment.[28]

A. MUST RESTRICT. States are required to disallow speech that incites discrimination or violence against a group of people based on their identity. Incitement is a call to action, going beyond promoting an idea.[29] This requirement is codified in Article 20 of the ICCPR, which says that incitement to hate (together with the propaganda for war) 'shall be prohibited by

27 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), *United Nations Treaty Series*, 999. Other relevant treaties include: International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965), *United Nations Treaty Series*, 660; Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), *United Nations Treaty Series*, 78.

28 See pages 12–16 in United Nations Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech: Detailed Guidance on Implementation for United Nations Field Presences (United Nations, 2020).

29 Article 20

law.' Under the ICCPR, this the only non-authorized type of speech, and one of the few types of private conduct that states must prohibit, indicating how seriously the international community treats incitement to hate.

B. CAN RESTRICT. Even if it does not amount to prohibited incitement, states may restrict hate speech to achieve legitimate social goals, namely, to protect the rights or reputations of others or for public order.[30] These exceptions are stated in Article 19 of the ICCPR, which protects freedom of expression. Most countries have defamation laws and many have anti-harassment laws, which can be used to combat hate speech in ways consistent with international law. Many states also have laws against expression likely to cause inter-group conflict, which if narrowly tailored may fall into this category of legitimate restrictions.

C. LEGALLY ALLOWED. Expression that some would consider hate speech must not be criminalized if it does not cause the harms specified in international law. The most controversial of such cases are types of speech that offend but do not threaten people's internationally recognized rights. International law is clear that people's feelings are not legally entitled to protection from offence, even if the expression offends their deep religious or patriotic loyalties.

There are important caveats to the first two principles that hate speech must or can be restricted. When reporting on governments' and courts' actions, journalists should consider the following:

- Under international law, hate speech regulation must satisfy all the requirements of the so-called 'three-part test' for speech restrictions[31]:

  1. Restrictions must follow clearly written laws. Vague or overly broad laws tend to be abused, silencing socially valuable speech.
  2. Restrictions must serve a legitimate purpose, as spelled out in Article 19 of the ICCPR. The commonly cited rationales of preserving harmony or protecting the honour of national leaders or symbols are not legitimate goals for hate speech law. Nor should the law protect religions or other belief systems from criticism – it is believers' rights to practise their faith, not the content of their beliefs, that need legal protection.[32]
  3. Restrictions must be a necessary and proportionate means of achieving the stated public-interest goal. Restrictions that are too broad or too punitive would discourage legitimate expression as well as hate speech.

- Hate speech regulation must abide by the overarching human rights principle of equality. This principle is mocked when hate speech laws protect some favoured community against criticism while allowing others to be vilified. This is true of many countries' blasphemy laws. It is also how many countries' laws against insults and causing offence are misapplied, even if on paper they give all groups equal protection.

- Hate speech regulation must operate under the umbrella of the rule of law, where criminal cases are adjudicated by independent courts and everyone has equal recourse to the law. State actors and other powerful individuals and groups must not be above the law. When governments propose new hate speech legislation, the surrounding political and legal environment will have a major impact on how it actually plays out – protecting vulnerable groups or strengthening dominant ones.

30 See explainer: 'The Legitimate Limits to Freedom of Expression: the Three-Part Test,' video, (UNESCO, 2021).

31 See explainer: 'The Right to Freedom of Expression Under International Law' (Media Defence); and video: 'The Legitimate Limits to Freedom of Expression: the Three-Part Test' (UNESCO, 2021). http://www.law-democracy.org/live/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/foe-briefingnotes-2.pdf

32 See: 'Freedom of Religion or Belief: Report of the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief,' A/HRC/40/58 (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2019).

There are also important caveats to the idea of 'legal' hate speech:

- Legally allowable does not always mean socially desirable or morally right. For example, although anti-blasphemy law goes against the principle that beliefs should not be shielded from criticism, a legal freedom to blaspheme does not mean media should use that freedom for wanton and insensitive attacks on people's deeply held religious beliefs, regardless of the impact on people. Media self-regulation and professional ethics are necessary to assess the value and costs of legal hate speech in a given context and to adjust accordingly. Governments, similarly, can use means other than law, especially counter speech and rules for public servants to discourage and marginalize legal hate speech.

- While it is not advisable (or even possible) to prohibit all discriminatory speech, states can use instruments other than law to help promote a culture of tolerance. Media actors, digital platforms and other groups can also help make the public more resistant to hate speech, including by cultivating media and information literacy.[33]

STILL EVOLVING

There are ongoing debates about hate speech law. One key issue is which identities should be covered. Drafted in the 1960s, the ICCPR's Article 20 refers to 'national, racial or religious hatred.' As consciousness about equality grows, it becomes clear that other types of identity are also subject to discrimination and need protection. For example, the South African constitution, written in the 1990s, adds 'gender.'[34] More recently, Brazil and many other countries have criminalized anti-LGBT hate speech.[35] The Council of Europe also lists 'disability' and 'gender identity' in its working definition of hate speech.[36] There are also local variations. Indian law recognizes hate speech based on caste, for example.[37]

The spirit of human rights law is to protect everyone's rights equally, as reflected in the UDHR's declaration that unfair discrimination based on any categorization is wrong. Just as the media pay attention to new health concerns as medical knowledge advances, they should also expect new dimensions of discrimination to become salient as awareness grows about how different communities are denied equal rights.

Technology is another major driver of change. Common behaviours that were relatively harmless in the past, such as sharing gossip through personal networks, have become issues of major public concern when multiplied exponentially through social media platforms. Most current debates on hate speech policy concern the responsibilities of the companies providing platforms. Digital platforms should put in place systems to identify, assess and mitigate the risks associated with hateful content, and increase transparency and accountability, for example.[38] While some have supported fact-checking initiatives and tweaked their filters, they have resisted challenges to their business models, which have made them conduits for conspiracy theories and hate propaganda. The size, power and popularity of these companies mean that these issues are unlikely to resolved soon.

Another major debate is over what level of harm should trigger legal intervention. The United States draws the line at incitement to *imminent violence*. Unlike the US, many European states restrict incitement to *discrimination* and any expression that *advocates*, *promotes* or *justifies* harm, even if it does not cross into direct incitement.[39] On the other hand, the US generally takes a stronger stand than Europe against *actual* discrimination (as opposed to *incitement* to discrimination), such as unfair rules on religious dress and places of worship.

33 'Promoting tolerance, human dignity and fundamental human rights,' UNESCO.

34 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Section 16. See 'Hate Speech,' Information Sheet, South African Human Rights Commission.

35 'Brazil High Court Rules Homophobia Punishable By Prison' Agence France Presse, 22 August 2023.

36 'On Combating Hate Speech,' ECRI General Policy Recommendation No. 15, European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (Council of Europe, 2016).

37 'Caste-Hate Speech' (International Dalit Solidarity Network, 2021).

38 'Guidelines for the Governance of Digital Platforms: Safeguarding Freedom of Expression and Access to Information through a Multi-stakeholder Approach' (UNESCO, 2023); 'Letting the sun shine in: transparency and accountability in the digital age' (UNESCO, 2021).

39 For a comparative analysis, see: Toby Mendel, 'Does International Law Provide for Consistent Rules on Hate Speech?,' in *The Content and Context of Hate Speech: Rethinking Regulation and Responses*, ed. Michael Herz and Péter Molnár (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 417–29.

While incitement and advocacy work indirectly, by influencing a third party to act against the target group, hate speech can also have a direct impact, making the group's members feel unwelcome and so deterring them from enjoying their full rights. It is difficult to regulate such speech without crossing the line into policing offended feelings. Some legal scholars suggest the right balance can be struck by focusing on whether the hate speech diminishes the target's *dignity.*[40]

Media ethics and hate speech

While debates continue around the edges of hate speech jurisprudence, these legal disputes need not delay *ethical* deliberation about media responsibilities. For at least a century, journalists around the world have recognized that a professional ethos of public service and social responsibility is what distinguishes their vocation from personal self-expression, advertising, and propaganda.

Media organizations and practitioners have developed professional principles and codes of ethics to help them navigate the daily decisions they have to make.[41] Most of these frameworks are implicitly or explicitly grounded in democratic values and human rights standards. The International Federation of Journalists' (IFJ) Global Charter of Ethics for Journalists is based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other major texts of international law. It provides specific guidance on hate speech: 'Journalists shall ensure that the dissemination of information or opinion does not contribute to hatred or prejudice and shall do their utmost to avoid facilitating the spread of discrimination on grounds such as geographical, social or ethnic origin, race, gender, sexual orientation, language, religion, disability, political and other opinions.'[42] South Africa's press code also includes a section on hate speech, asking the media to balance 'their right and duty to report and comment on all matters of legitimate public interest' against the obligation not to publish hate speech.[43]

Even when they do not make direct reference to hate speech, existing media ethics codes contain many relevant principles and pointers. These include the following:

VERIFY

- News organizations should fact-check newsmakers' claims before reporting them. This basic professional discipline of verification is one of the most important ways for the media to combat hate speech, as hate campaigns routinely ride on disinformation. 'The notion of urgency or immediacy in the dissemination of information shall not take precedence over the verification of facts, sources and/or the offer of a reply,' says IFJ.[44] If the source is saying something untrue or misleading, the story should say this upfront or choose not to report it. Fact-checking after publication is known to be not as effective as 'prebunking', which journalism trainers recommend as a way to inoculate the public against misinformation.[45]

RESPECT DIVERSITY

- Many news organizations embrace the core value of respect for diversity, which is a key antidote against hate. 'Recognize diversity in human societies with all their races, cultures and beliefs and their values and intrinsic individualities so as to present unbiased and faithful reflection of them,' one major international news organization enjoins its journalists.[46] Like the Indonesian and South African press councils' codes, Britain's editors' code says media must 'avoid prejudicial or pejorative reference to an individual's race, colour, religion, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation

40 Jeremy Waldron, *The Harm in Hate Speech* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012).
41 https://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp and https://ethicaljournalismnetwork.org/can-journalists-trust-the-u-n-system-to-help-control-hate-speech
42 'Global Charter of Ethics for Journalists' (International Federation of Journalists, 2019).
43 Code of Ethics and Conduct for South African Print and Online Media, Press Council of South Africa.
44 'Global Charter of Ethics for Journalists' (International Federation of Journalists, 2019).
45 See: Seth Smalley, 'Prebunking is effective at fighting misinfo, study finds', *Poynter*, 1 September 2022.
46 'Code of Ethics', Al Jazeera.

or to any physical or mental illness or disability.'[47] Choosing the right words can be a challenge, but professional organizations offer stylebooks explaining different terms for writing about race, religion and gender.[48]

AVOID STEREOTYPES

- Most ethical codes tell journalists, including visual journalists[49], to avoid stereotypes, which attach particular characteristics to a group. These generalizations are misleading and unfair, because no community is homogeneous. Stereotypes promote us-them thinking; negative stereotypes can scapegoat and dehumanize. Journalists 'must be sensitive to unconscious stereotyping and dated assumptions', says one international news agency.[50] 'We should also be suspicious of country stereotypes – the usually negative notions about a national character,' it adds. The most universal stereotypes are probably those attached to gender. Tanzania's media council tells media to 'prohibit the use of sexist language in their coverage' and refrain from 'reinforcing gender oppression and stereotypes.'[51]

TELL ALL SIDES

- The code of the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) in the United States urges journalists to be proactive and 'seek sources whose voices we seldom hear.'[52] This is in line with the role that many journalists willingly accept, to speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves. They try to reflect the views of all groups affected by an issue, not just powerful leaders and majorities. To be comprehensive and complete, stories must 'include all affected communities, not just those with attractive demographics' and 'take into account diverse backgrounds and perspectives', says one widely used journalism manual.[53] Such practices are a bulwark against hate propaganda.

REPORT IN PROPORTION AND IN CONTEXT

- Extreme actors in a community often get more media coverage than its moderate voices. If audiences do not know that community well, they may generalize from such news and think of its members as more different and dangerous than they are. This can add to the cycle of fear and hate. To avoid this trap, journalism trainers remind reporters not to assume that extreme voices on a polarized issue are representative. They may be attention-seekers who do not speak for their community.[54] 'How many people actually agree with their views?' journalists should ask. 'Does the issue affect people in everyday life? ... Tailor coverage accordingly.'[55]

HANDLE ONLINE OPINION WITH CARE

- Online opinion – social media posts, likes and other responses – is a quick and convenient way for journalists to sense what is on people's minds. However, it is always unrepresentative and frequently inauthentic.[56] It is unrepresentative not only because of the digital divide but also because commercial platforms' algorithms promote virality over nuance and moderation. It is often inauthentic, produced by computational propaganda. The use of such methods to sow discord and hate is well documented. Journalism ethics codes urge caution when citing or sharing such views.

47 'The Editors' Code of Practice', Editors' Code of Practice Committee, UK. See also: Journalism Code of Ethics, Press Council of Indonesia; Code of Ethics and Conduct for South African Print and Online Media, Press Council of South Africa.
48 See, for example, Religion Stylebook (Religion Newswriters Foundation); and Stylebook for Gender-Sensitive Reporting (Asian American Journalists Association Asia).
49 'Code of Ethics', National Press Photographers Association;
50 'Standards & Values', Reuters.
51 Gender in Media Policy (Media Council of Tanzania, 2019). See also: 'Guidance note: reporting on gender' (Press Council of South Africa, 2021).
52 'SPJ Code of Ethics', Society of Professional Journalists.
53 'The Elements of Journalism', tomrosenstiel.com
54 'Hate speech and actions', Online News Association Ethics.
55 Debra L. Mason, ed., Reporting on Religion: A Primer on Journalism's Best Beat (Westerville, Ohio: Religion Newswriters Association, 2016).
56 Andrew R. N. Ross, Andrew Chadwick, and Cristian Vaccari, 'Digital Media and the Proliferation of Public Opinion Cues Online: Biases and Vulnerabilities in the New Attention Economy', in *The Routledge Companion to Political Journalism* (Routledge, 2021).

AVOID HYPE

- Metaphorical and subjective language can sensationalize matters, 'skewing the reality of the situation or misleading the reader or viewer into assumptions and impressions that are wrong and potentially harmful', as one global news agency warns its journalists. 'A "flood" of immigrants, for example, may in reality be a relatively small number of people,' it says. Such vague language may not be technically inaccurate, but more precise descriptions would not only be more accurate but also minimize the potential for harm.[57]

AVOID CLICKBAIT

- The media use creative methods to make their stories more interesting. 'Take special care not to misrepresent or oversimplify in promoting, previewing or summarizing a story,' SPJ says.[58] Headlines and illustrations are commonly added late in the production process by time-pressed staff who are new to the story. The risk of over-sensationalizing is greatly heightened by digital distribution: paywalls prevent readers accessing the whole story; screen grabs have the same effect. So, elements meant only to attract attention may be all the reader sees. Editors can minimize this potential harm by ensuring that elements used to draw attention are not in themselves toxic when viewed in isolation. Photos and graphics should meet the same ethical standards as text.

MODERATE COMMENTS

- Media policies for online comment sections vary greatly. Some prioritize engagement and do not care about relevance or civility, making their comment sections fertile ground for hate speech. To avoid this, media could follow the example of organizations that see comments as a reflection on their outlet's brand and therefore take responsibility for them through various moderation mechanisms.[59] As this is labour intensive, mainstream news outlets increasingly close the online comment sections on their own apps and websites. However, discussion may continue on their social media pages, where platform companies have tried to disavow responsibility for moderation.

ACCEPT A DUTY OF CARE

- Journalists are proud of following the evidence wherever it leads, but their ethical codes also tell them to minimize harm. For example, even if privacy laws do not stop reporters from intruding on victims' grief or interviewing minors, journalists' own ethical codes advise caution. Such codes acknowledge that journalists have a duty of care for people in highly vulnerable situations. 'Ethical journalism treats sources, subjects, colleagues and members of the public as human beings deserving of respect,' says the SPJ code.[60] Such a commitment can help journalists navigate the challenge of hate speech.

CREDIT: FILIP BUNKENS/UNSPLASH

Even when professional codes state clear principles, it can be a challenge to apply them in day-to-day decision making. Some media organizations and journalism trainers offer protocols to follow in specific circumstances, such as what to do if a guest uses hate speech on live television.[61] Working out strategies for different scenarios beforehand can help journalists make better decisions in real time.

Applying professional strengths

This guidance has stressed that the hate speech problem does not require changing what it means to be a journalist; only that the media dig deep into the profession's strengths. In addition to its tradition of ethical deliberation, there are other practices that can help journalism improve how it covers and responds to hate speech.

57 'Standards & Values,' Reuters.
58 'SPJ Code of Ethics,' Society of Professional Journalists. See also 'Clickbait and metrics,' Online News Association Ethics.
59 See, for example: 'The Comments Section,' The New York Times.
60 'SPJ Code of Ethics,' Society of Professional Journalists.
61 See, for example: Kate Hairsine, 'Reporting Hate Speech – Practical Tips for Journalists,' *DW Akademie* (blog), 1 January 2016.

INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISM. Tried-and-tested methods of investigative journalism are highly relevant tools against emerging hate merchants as well as full-blown hate campaigns. Just as reporters investigate corruption by following the money, they can also dig beneath the surface manifestations of hate to find out which powerful actors benefit from sowing discord, and reveal the network of middlemen and enablers. They can help identify weaknesses in governance and law that are exploited by agents of hate, as they would when investigating illegal trafficking. They can use data journalism methods to tell stories behind the emerging data about hate speech on social media platforms.[62]

COLLABORATIVE JOURNALISM. Journalism's financial crisis means that media organizations are usually understaffed when reporting major problems such as sophisticated, multi-actor hate campaigns. Increasingly, media are collaborating to carry out public interest journalism. Cross-border partnerships help journalists crack stories involving transnational flows – and hate propaganda is a problem that in many cases should be analysed transnationally. Media organizations can also collaborate on fact-checking.[63] Investigative journalists increasingly cooperate with NGOs and research organizations with special expertise. Hatewatch groups and other human rights defenders would make suitable partners for media covering hate.[64]

COMMUNITY JOURNALISM. Many media have an admirable record in various forms of community journalism, through which reporters get close to the ground to understand and voice the interests of people who are often neglected by major parties and corporate media.[65] Such efforts, including approaches such as constructive or solutions journalism, often reveal common ground between identity groups, thus cutting through the us-them divides that are encouraged and exploited by hate mongers.[66]

MEDIA FREEDOM, INDEPENDENCE, DIVERSITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Most journalism codes of ethics address journalists working on stories, but these individuals work within institutional and politico-legal contexts that greatly affect their ability to work professionally and improve ethical practices.

Within the news organization, a more diverse newsroom combined with a culture of open communication is one way to check against unconscious prejudices.[67] Editorial decision-making can better resist discriminatory ideas when newsrooms reflect the wider society and minority reporters are empowered to speak up.

Media accountability systems within organizations, such as a public editor or ombudsman, or at the industry level, such as independent press councils, can also help alert the newsroom to biases against minorities.[68] Some news organizations go the extra mile, literally, to understand their diverse society by organizing 'town hall' meetings with readers in different parts of the city or country. Opening channels of communication with equality commissions and human rights organizations can give media earlier warning of looming problems.

The importance of media freedom has been stressed earlier. Although there is a tension between hate speech and free speech, hate speech is most dangerous when free speech is subject to arbitrary, over-broad, and disproportionate restrictions. The media need to be free from government control if they are to serve their public role.

62 Resources for investigative journalism include Mark Lee Hunter, Story-Based Inquiry: A Manual for Investigative Journalists (UNESCO, 2011); and the Global Investigative Journalism Network.

63 Fact-checking coalitions were set up ahead of elections in Indonesia, Nigeria and other countries. See Astudestra Ajengrastri, 'Collaborating to combat mis-/disinformation around Indonesia's elections', *International Journalists' Network*, 17 May 2019; Phillip Anjorin, 'The Nigeria Fact-Checkers' Coalition showed how collaborative journalism can work in West Africa', *Nieman Lab*, 18 October 2023.

64 For example, the news outlet Rest of World collaborated with Digital Witness Lab to investigate a political party's decentralized use of a private messaging app for campaign messages laced with misinformation and hate speech.

65 See, for example, 'Community media networks in Latin America', WACC Global, 23 February 2018.

66 Kristina Lund Jørgensen and Jakob Risbro, Handbook for Constructive Journalism (Copenhagen, Denmark: International Media Support, 2022).

67 See: 'Media Diversity', Media Diversity Institute.

68 Susanne Fengler, 'Accountability in Journalism', in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*, 2019.

Media independence – including newsrooms' editorial independence from their employers' political and business interests – is also essential for professional practice. The media can be major propagators of hate when their owners are personally committed to an intolerant vision for their country and require their media properties to play along, or when owners are cronies of political leaders with such visions. Independent public service media in many countries structurally insulate newsrooms' day-to-day ethical and editorial judgements from corporate or political interference.[69]

Media diversity[70], with a range of outlets serving and speaking for minority communities, is also required to resist majoritarian tendencies in society and sound alerts against hate speech and hate crimes. Small, community or ethnic media are often among the targets when hate campaigns attempt to suppress a minority community. Such media are hard to sustain[71] and often operate at the margins of the industry. National press associations and big media can help with recognition, training and networking opportunities.

Complexities and dilemmas

Dealing with hate speech can be frustrating, because it is a complex issue that defies simple formulaic answers. This guide does not pretend to have all the answers. However, understanding the complexities can prepare journalists mentally to deal with them. This section highlights a few common dilemmas. Even if there are no obvious solutions, journalists can try to avoid making problems worse. Media attuned to these dilemmas are more likely to strike the right balance than those unprepared for the challenge.

HOW TO COVER HATE SPEECH BY HIGH-PROFILE NEWSMAKERS?

Media should not assist in the spread of hate speech – but there may be a strong news justification for reporting what public figures say, however distasteful. It may also be in the public interest to let people know that newsmakers are using hate speech. Besides, suppressing the speech of populists or voicing moral condemnation often backfires – they can milk sympathy by portraying themselves as noble underdogs going against establishment media. This feeds into their us-versus-them rhetoric.

The problem is compounded when such parties move from the fringe to the mainstream, building a sizeable following. This is a dilemma especially for public service media in democracies. They are required to protect democratic values, but also be neutral in their coverage of major parties. How to achieve both goals when covering parties that threaten equal rights is a conundrum that media are still trying to solve.

WHAT IF BOTH SIDES CLAIM TO BE THE VICTIMS?

Hate speech threatens vulnerable groups – but vulnerability depends on context. Members of a community may be victims of injustice in some situations, while in a different context their fellow members may be perpetrators of harms against others. Such contradictions give rise to many hate speech controversies.

For example, politicians and media may have good reason to speak up strongly against how a segment of a religious or ethnic minority has engaged in extremist violence. However, framing such incidents as threats in sweeping terms can promote hatred and intolerance directed against other members of the community who are not associated with radicalized elements. Similarly, politicians and media may legitimately criticize geopolitical or economic domination by a more powerful foreign country. But this can spill over as xenophobia against nationals of that country who are in a vulnerable position, such as immigrant workers and students.

69 Marius Dragomir, Reporting Facts: Free from Fear or Favour (Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2020).
70 Also referred to as media pluralism. See 'Media Pluralism', UNESCO.
71 See: Community Media Sustainability (UNESCO, 2017).

Victimhood can be so subjective that the same language and symbols may be perceived as legitimate expressions of protest by some audiences but as dangerous hate speech by others. Journalists reporting on such controversies may have their own strong opinions, but they should recognize that there may be major faults and genuine grievances on both sides – all which need to be treated seriously. Reporting such controversies in ways that do not add to harms requires the highest standards of professional skill and editorial judgement. Reference to human rights standards and definitions can help clarify contested claims.

IS OUTRAGE GENUINE OR MANUFACTURED?

Although human rights law protects expression that is merely offensive and does not incite acts of hatred, many media organizations and governments treat strong offence as reason enough to trigger moderation or regulation. It may seem prudent to act before being offensive escalates to incitement. This may be true in many situations: comments or acts that offend a group can be an early warning sign of intention to harm its members. Bowing to outrage is also administratively expedient, as managing complaints and protests is time-consuming.

However, groups struggling for justice often use strong, provocative language as part of their own repertoire of protest. In such situations, a privileged group resisting challenges to an unfair status quo may claim to be deeply offended. This is one reason why the human rights approach opposes laws against blasphemy and other insults: these tend to be used by dominant communities to defend their status, at the expense of the rights of minorities.

It is also common for politicians and community leaders to exaggerate or manufacture indignation and outrage as a tactic to mobilize followers and put opponents on the defensive.[72] This is a key method of threat inversion: in a society becoming more diverse, dominant groups wanting to protect their privileges claim that minorities' places of worship, diets, clothing and other peaceful practices are intolerable attacks on their own culture and values.

Offence, as such, is therefore shaky ground on which to build an ethical response to provocative speech. Media can instead adopt the idea of *dignity* as a touchstone. Dignity refers to the equal worth of humans, which is core to their ability to participate in a democratic society. Provocative speech may offend dominant groups as much as minority groups, but it may not be of equal threat to their dignity. Legal experts have proposed dignity as a useful concept when assessing the harms of hate speech without falling into the trap of regulating the causing or taking of offence.[73]

CULTURES OF HATE

Media may be part of a society pervaded by a culture of intolerance. Most societies have moral blind spots that make them insensitive to injustices against perceived outsiders, including other nations and unpopular minorities within their national borders. Media professionals themselves, being part of society, may be equally prone to these ways of thinking. The professional ethos of journalism asks practitioners to check their own biases.[74] They can apply intellectual curiosity and an open mind to try to understand, for example, the protests and lobbying by unpopular minorities. This is a good starting point for journalists who want to address previously unquestioned assumptions.

Discriminatory attitudes may be normalized and perpetuated through the education system, popular culture and religious teaching. This can make it difficult to speak out against popular prejudices. The general public expects the press to speak truth to power, but it does not take kindly to the press exposing faults in the majority's own values, beliefs, and actions. To redress these biases and cover their societies more fairly may require as much moral courage as when journalists challenge powerful governments and corporations.

72 Cherian George, *Hate Spin: The Manufacture of Religious Offense and Its Threat to Democracy* (Boston, Mass: MIT Press, 2016).

73 Jeremy Waldron, *The Harm in Hate Speech* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012).

74 The SPJ Code of Ethics says, 'Journalists should examine the ways their values and experiences may shape their reporting.'

Summary

IN CONCLUSION, WHAT WOULD AN ETHICAL APPROACH TO COVERING HATE SPEECH LOOK LIKE?

1. **Media refer to human rights principles, which say that freedom of expression is essential for building more equal societies but requires restraint to prevent harms.**

2. **Media track campaigns likely to harm groups in vulnerable situations and do not fixate on speech incidents just because they provoke the loudest outrage.**

3. **Media investigate hate as an industry backed by major investors and sustained by a supply chain of various producers and distributors.**

4. **Media collaborate with other media and specialized organizations to overcome their resource limitations and produce in-depth, high-impact coverage of hate campaigns.**

5. **Media report governmental, judicial, societal and corporate responses to hate speech in the light of international human rights benchmarks.**

6. **Media adopt professional ethics designed to minimize harm, and apply these to the coverage of diverse communities in their society and the world.**

ABOUT THIS GUIDE

This guide is the first in a series of guides for journalists prepared jointly by the UNESCO Communication and Information and Education Sectors on covering hate speech and its different manifestations.

THE GUIDE IS AUTHORED BY CHERIAN GEORGE.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Cherian George is a Professor in the Department of Journalism, Hong Kong Baptist University. He researches freedom of expression, censorship, hate propaganda, and polarisation. He is also the co-founder and co-editor of What's Up, a monthly newspaper that practises "values-driven journalism" for schoolchildren in Singapore. Before joining academia, he was a journalist with The Straits Times, Singapore. www.cheriangeorge.net

This document can be downloaded at https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000392378

Published in 2025 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France

AUTHOR: CHERIAN GEORGE

COPY-EDITING: JAY SIVELL

COVER PHOTO: DRAZEN ZIGIC/ FREEPIK*

DESIGN AND LAY-OUT: LUIZA MAXIMO, PEDRO CARVALHO

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union as part of the project on "Countering Holocaust denial and distortion". Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. The European Union cannot be held responsible for them.