Hate speech in Tunisian media: About the stereotyping of bodies and ideas
Introduction

The rise of hate speech and incitement to violence can be simplified in the Socio-Cultural trend based on the idea of denying the other. Dominant groups or a dominant regime seek to deny the other by creating fragile social models that are easy to control. Perhaps the most prominent model around which the idea of exile revolves is the “outcast model”. This model of exclusion that can be stigmatized is the product of patriarchal domination, which in turn is a complicated social product. They make their own ostracized rhetoric inspired by literature that abolishes the other and move toward a dominant trend seeking to reshape bodies by shunting the idea that it is a tool of political action and protest. Therefore, hate speeches that have invaded screens, newspaper pages and websites focus their attention on women, sexual and gender minorities through stigmatization and normalization with violence and incitement to committing it.

Hate speeches include harming human dignity, calling for killing and moral revenge, discrimination, humiliation, retribution, indignation, infidelity, and stigmatization. According to the professional ethics observatory in the updated written and electronic press within the National Union of Tunisian Journalists, hate speech is considered “every text regardless of its size, made through any means of direct or indirect reporting. D that includes abuse, insult, misdemeanor, inferiority or disloyalty of a person or group based on race, religion, political
or geographic affiliation, color, language, sex, nature of occupation or appearance. It also calls for discrimination and superiority over others on racial, sectarian or similar grounds, and any call for hostility to immigrants and minorities or for incitement to derogation from their rights. It is also any humiliating metaphor or expression against individuals and groups.

Chapter 52 of Decree No. 115 on freedom of the press, printing and publication states that: Anyone who directly advocates by means acts described in chapter 50 of this Decree inciting hatred between races, religions or the population shall be punished by imprisonment from one to three years and fined from one to two thousand dinars, and the same incitement of discrimination, the use of hostile means or violence or the dissemination of discriminatory racial ideas.

International treaties and laws agree that everyone must enjoy his or her civil and political rights and public and individual freedoms without discrimination or distinction. Most of these treaties addressed the dilemma of hate speech, where article 20 paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and political Rights states: "Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence is prohibited by law." In accordance with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, it is considered that any publication of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, any incitement to racial discrimination and any act of violence against any race or group of another color or ethnic origin; Any assistance to racist activities, including their financing, is also a punishable offense. Racial discrimination "means any discrimination, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, color, descent or national or ethnic origin, which aims or entails the denial, enjoyment or exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms on an equal basis; In the political, economic, social or cultural field or in any other field of public life. Article 19 also took care of the growing hate speech in the media within the so-called "Camden Principles", where hatred was defined as: A state of mind characterized by sharp and irrational animosities of hostility, stigmatization and contempt toward the group or person inciting against it, calling on all countries to

---

1- Chapter 50 of Decree No. 115 states that incitement to violence and hatred can be made either through speeches, sayings or threats in public places, or through publications, photos, engravings, symbols, or in any of the written or illustrated forms offered for sale or for public consideration in Public places or public meetings, either by means of comments and advertisements or displayed for public view, or by any means of the audio-visual and electronic media.
adopt legislation that criminalizes inflammatory rhetoric. Through this brief presentation of the concept of hate speech domestically and internationally, we note that there is no uniform and consistent definition of hate speech that remains problematic for some, especially since these definitions have not referred to the boundaries between freedom of expression and hate speech that can serve as a cover for repression and restriction. This paper therefore wants to break up hate speech in the media by understanding its mechanics and focusing on understanding and analyzing those directed, especially against women, sexual minorities and gender minorities in Tunisia.

**Media and manipulating minds**

We can only understand the structure and manifestations of hate speech by understanding the structure of the media that broadcast these speeches with their symbolic violence. The media has the power to guide and reshape opinions and positions within its political direction and line, producing hegemonic letters that the recipient can easily adopt and reproduce based on his background and without awareness of their seriousness. The media influence the vision of the individual for himself, for others and for the community, they are able to develop and role-play it through repetitive, condensing and muse-making rhetoric. The French philosopher Régis Debray considers that the media “work for the benefit of the individual and not the community, for the sense, not the mind, for the individual, and not for the universality.” These three features are synaptic in the new pillars that will determine the nature of the dominant discourse, and the usefulness of its bearer. At the same time, they provide an individual strategy and the imbalance of the collective system that is no longer in need of rules, issues or a conceptual payload. We can go a long way in analyzing what Debray said more than thirty years ago by asking a fundamental question: “Does media thinks”? In fact, the media, specifically television, are biased toward watching rather than attempting to destroy traditional intellectual structures and to carry out excavations to produce real value and meaning. The media” is driven by the logic of the thumbs.

«Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence is prohibited by law»

**Article 20, paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and political Rights states**
up behind more public interest (...) and does not accept too much the expression of thought because it looks for the emergency, the immediate, urgent and exciting the odies “that have become a hegemonic power”. The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu comments on this point: “One of the major problems that television poses is the problem of the relationships between thinking and speed. Can you think about gasping ideas quickly? Is not television condemned for creating instant thinkers, “when it gives the talk to thinkers who have been forced to think more quickly? Thinkers must think faster than they do... think through” common ideas”. The “dominant and common ideas “about which Flaubert spoke, they are those that are accepted by everyone, trivial, vulgar, traditional, centrist, and common, are also those that when received feels as if they have already been accepted so that there is no place to raise the problem of receiving and making a sense afterwards 4 “. Television eliminates our ability to think, criticize, and think about accountability, for it is the ultimate truth holder, thus ensuring that it “tracts to the market of certainty 5 “. The dominant media rely on experts “in the illusion industry, the disseminating of fallacies and the production of inciting speeches, relying on the inability of the receiving part of audience to form an opinion or position on a case. People are looking for easy location with or against stress and thought and that is what media offer: Ready-made ideas, ready-made situations, ready-made analyzes, ready-made proposals, ready-made point of view. Thus, the prevailing ideas form the dominant trend that dominates the knowledge and value system forms. In the process of guidance, the media rely not only on the inability of some to produce a decisive opinion or position, but also on those pre-prepared ideas that represent the stable land upon which the majority stands. Let us ask the following question: Why do people read this newspaper alone or watch this program alone or hear this radio alone? Because they find themselves among the speeches produced by the media, whose views are based in large part on practical ethics or the ethics of the class, as Pierre Bourdieu calls it, in a very brief, on their value and belief system linked to their social, economic and cultural surroundings.

Let us be more pragmatic and talk about Tunisia’s dominant media, which since 2011 has established false convictions for recipients, linking the left to blasphemy and aversion, sexual freedom with homosexuality and moral decay, women's liberation and equality with a tragic plot to target Islamic identity. All these fallacies are the banner of hate speech, which relies on dodgy tactics and strategies, with the deliberate absence of genuine intellectuals and thinkers, whose task is to “break down stereotypes and reductive generalizations that impose severe restrictions on human thought and communication among human beings 6 “. Let's take the example of Al-SADA, one of the most prominent websites that incite violence and hatred, according to the 2016 report of the Ethics Observatory on written and electronic press.7

---

4- Ibid., pp. 65 and 66
5- French researcher Pascal Boniface in his book “False Intellectuals” mentioned within the approved references
6- Edward, Saeed, Intellectuals and Power, a translation by Muhammad Mannai, A Vision for Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 2006, p. 19
7- In this report, the Professional Ethics Observatory worked on 19 media outlets from the written and electronic press, and during six months of monitoring, 5007 violations were recorded, of which 267 were violations of hate speech, 146 were violations of daily paper newspapers in the Arabic and French languages and 15 violations of Weekly, newspapers 106 breaches of electronic newspapers, and 8 breaches of two private radio sites and a single breach of the location of a private television channel. The report revealed that the Arabic-language daily newspapers published the highest percentage of breaches (50 percent), most of which were reported in Al-Dameer newspaper, with a percentage reached 22.83 percent. As for websites, Al-Sada received the highest
February, 2016, they published an article entitled “Ignorant but yet they are university students with only excludible thoughts,” in which the writer attacks the modernist educated elite, which reads as follows: They are ignorant, but they are university students and teachers, carrying only left-wing exclusivity, and never condemning except ideological extremism, and never believe in closeness or dialogue as well, and that they believe in it hypocrisy (some of their speeches). The fact that they have crossed the border and preceded them outside the country is a good proof of this cheap mentality, ... their ignorance harm citizens. Citizens only see their bad behaviors, the cacophony of thought and words.” They are used to talk in the morning and on Sunday evening in shameful media outlets which praise their ignorance, they are hosted by media corrupt teams that often don’t understand what they are saying “(...) he said. This passage resembles all the clichés, generalizations, and demonizing the left and describing each person holding a different thought form what is typical and familiar as a devil. In the same context of demonizing all channels are involved, among those channels is” Al-Insan “channel which prompted the Independent High Authority for Audiovisual Communication” HAICA “to interfere in order to stop speeches of hatred and inciting violence.”

A financial fine of 50,000 dinars was imposed on the channel, and a three-month suspension of the” Khlik Ma’ama “program for violating human dignity, incitement to hatred, and a call for exclusion against a group of Tunisians. The Board’s monitoring unit recorded an interposition with its guest, Al-Sassah Muhammad Amin Al-Qurbi, known as” Rekoba,” in which he accused the leftists of” employment and normalization with the former regime,” saying: The leftists were just puppets of the ruling party that Bin Ali exploited in his war against the Islamists. Mohammad Al-Sharfi is the head of the snake, and he is the one who called for uprooting the Islamists.” Also guest Mohamed Al-Affas in the show “What did you bring today with you” demonized the elites or as he said stereotypes demons as he said that “demons of elites view pilgrimage money as wasting national money and sacrifice of the feast as wasting animals, demons of elites consider bringing artists who are originally the tyrants’ puppets and shoe lickers, the red percentage of violations, 31.52 percent, out of a total of 38 percent.

8- The decision and its reasons can be found on the official website of the Higher Independent Authority for Audiovisual Media at this link: http://bit.ly/2PemBZu
nights ‘drainage ridiculously as a kind of investment in’, and sorry when I say that, in culture.”...

The host did not intervene and carry out his obligation to address such letters on the basis of the provisions of chapter 24 of the conditions book for the acquisition of allowing broadcasting and the exploitation of a private television channel, which states in point II and III that: The license holder is obliged to ensure that no reason is given for exclusion, marginalization and imminence and to prevent indecent and insulting persons, whether by journalists working in the media organization or by guests of programs broadcasted by the institution, whether recorded or directly broadcasted on air, and that journalists are qualified to take responsibility for dealing with such abuses.

Let’s just look back at the report of the Ethics Observatory on written and electronic press entitled “Media engagement with Terrorism, hate speech and Armed conflict: December - 2015 to May 2016” to stop breaches in newspapers and websites. The importance of this report, the latest report by the Ethics Monitor, is that no further synthesis reports have yet been published after it, on 19 media outlets ranging from written to electronic. What is important to us in the context of hate speech is the nature of the breaches, the insults and humiliation, as reported in the report, the highest percentage was for hate speech (24.28%) and stigmatization (18.48%) followed by discrimination (11.59%) and the rest were distributed differently according to the nature of the breaches) excommunication, call for murder, hateful symptoms, etc. (The report confirmed that although these rates are small, they are not free from the seriousness of their impact on the target. Opinion articles) analyzes and columns (were linked to hate speech), with the Observatory reporting (46.01%) 127 followed by news reporting (28.25%) 78 then the headlines with (15.94%) 44 photo-error (3.26%) and fewer other forms of journalism violations. In hate speech, the most important subjects of politics, terrorism and religion were overshadowed and described by being evil and infidels that should be excluded. This frequency has created a series of common terms such as: Nude / Shame Media / Excisionist / Extremist Left / Coupist / Conspirator / Masonic Infidel / Shiite / Atheist / ISIS / Without Honor / Media Parameters / Political Parameters / Tyrant / Apostates / Enemies of Islamic Identity. One of the most dangerous words the report spotted in opinion articles called a person “Jew” and “mentally disabled,” along with the description of liberation as “prostitution” and “legalized enslavement,” which entrenches negative public perceptions that may lead to murder, moral or material retaliation. In these terms, which fuel the outcast “model,” we note

9- Among the decisions of the Board of the Independent Supreme Commission for Audiovisual Communication in Responding to the Hate Speech, the decision to suspend the “Hadith Rijal” program on the private radio channel “Najma FM” for two weeks, given what was included in one of the program’s broadcasts on November 18, 2018, From incitement to hatred and discriminatory speech on a regional basis, as the program intentionally broadcasted citizens’ opinions regarding the controversy surrounding an advertising banner for one of the telecom operators in relation to the victory of the Tunisian sports club Esperance in the African Champions League, which contained a speech urging violence, hatred and discrimination such as “a call for the coastal star above all and Sousse above all.” The broadcast of such discriminatory and inflammatory speeches constitutes a violation of the provisions of Chapter 15 of the Terms of Conditions relating to obtaining a license to create and exploit a private radio channel, which states that the owner of the license must commit to not inciting violence and hatred, and it is also in violation of the requirements of Chapter 24 of the same Terms of Conditions, which states that the license holder or owner is obliged not to broadcast any speech inciting discrimination, hatred or violence, in particular on racial, ethnic, moral, religious, sexual, regional, or opinion grounds.
that it is about asking the body and individual freedoms. We will therefore focus more on hate speech directed against women, sexual and gender minorities as they represent the weakest link in the systematic war of persecution.

**Hate speech against women, sexual and gender minorities**

The body in modern social systems has become the main area of political and social activity, and the term “physical society,” developed by the English sociologist Brian Turner, has been used to express the heightened interest in the question of the body, which is central to understanding self-identity and social structures. Our bodies are an entity in need, a project that must be worked on and completed as part of an individual’s self-identity that always clashes with stigmatization and disinfection speeches. The media have contributed to perpetuating stereotypes about the bodies of women and the bodies of various gender advocates who are being described as not straight. We find that they accuse women, sexual and gender minorities, through television or radio programs based on sarcasm, shaming and clichés. The TV makes stars painted in a fake shine. Once they appear on large screens, they become opinion leaders. A small, culturally empty pyramid can cast its role in everything, influence recipients, reshape their attitudes, or solidify their convictions based on moral judgments. Most sketches in programs on the private channels celebrate the misogynism and are characterized with violence. Women are always portrayed as jealous, naive, weak, proficient only in “decoration of their bodies,” while men are smart, powerful, and decent. As for homosexuals and people with different sexual orientation, they have one image: A beard man and a dense hair at the chest, swaying, shaking his waist, screaming, wearing a veil, constantly moving and shaking his eyebrows, moving his hands as if he is dancing, and speaking with a plastic sound. As we have already pointed out, hate speech does not only mean calling for murder and incitement to violence, but also includes grudging and stigmatization, so such laughing knives in the wider public are pumps for hatred and ostracism. If we typed the word “perfect” on Al-sada site search engine and we read the titles, it would be enough to understand that the articles are inciting and non-subjective. The headlines alone repeat the same words as “the servants of demons,” “moral corruption,” “impotence,” “and the people of falsehood,” “homo.” “In looking at the content of the articles, we find them based on non-rational arguments and illogical inferences; all of them take the same sentences and phrases in an evocative manner, such as” part of the people who are adamant of God’s law who wants to embrace the moral abnormality “or” the measure of citizenship, belonging and loyalty of the invalid people is to commit to their corrupt approach. “These” disgraceful “qualities promoted by these sites isolate and stifling people of different sexual orientation from society. One of England’s most distinguished sociologists interested in questioning the body, Chris Schlang, considers that someone with a stigma “faces problems in social interaction with” ordinary people “and that may have devastating consequences for self-identity.” If a stigmatized person tries to become normal, he risks discovering a conflict between a virtual social identity and a realistic social identity.

---

11- Ibid, p.24
12- The phrase for Chris Challenge in his book “The Body and Social Theory” mentioned earlier, and he used it to talk about the media that perpetuates stereotypes of women and considers that they decorate their bodies in an inert way through makeup, clothing and jewelry, while men care about their muscles and strengthening their bodies
which can corrupt his social identity and isolate him from society and himself so that he becomes alone as a convicted person facing a world he wants “.How can women and sexual and gender minorities recover their bodies, loaded with unbearable burdens and weight, from the dominance of media, which has a profound impact on these bodies by promoting hate speech. The de facto denunciations are not sufficient to change reality and to counter the systematic incitement against untouchables “on the basis of their race, religion, class, sex or sexual orientation”. In this context, the decision of Haica on 28 March 2019 is a qualitative one on the subject of individual freedoms. The Board decided to give a financial fine to the 9th channel of 50 thousand dinars, suspend the “MAG” program for a month and consider the non-return of the channel) i.e. a repetition of the crime. In view of the violations of the 9th of March 2019 seminar, the introduction of the program sought questions concerning issues of particular concern to the private life of its guest, Muna Al-Gharbi, in an undignified manner and without regard to her psychological condition, and deliberately issued a series of moral judgments on her form and manner of being addressed by saying: “Your form is strange, and you view yourself as a man, and this is unacceptable in our society. A woman pursuing men’s shape and type is forbidden”. I think people before they know we have to know the secret behind your form, have you been sexually assaulted when you were a child? “? These statements, as provided for, may lead to discrimination or stigmatization, as well as what the duty of the press profession’s ethics impose which is to respect the private lives of guests. Among other qualitative decisions of HAICA is the decision to suspend the” with Alaa “program on the” Tunisian Al-Hiwar TV “channel for two months. This decision came in response to a petition issued by a group of citizens, in which more than 1500 people signed, against the normalization of program host Alaa Al-Shabi for his violence against women and reducing its danger. The young woman was laughed at on the 22 March 2019 episode for being sexual harassed by her father, Alaa al-Shabi, who tried to defend him and consider his egregious sexual acts as not harassment. The organization considered that the statement mentioned in the program episode, which belies the danger of sexual harassment on one hand and justify violence...
against women on the other, contradicts with the requirements of chapter 46 of the Tunisian Republic constitution, dated 27 January, 2014 which emphasizes the necessity of the state’s commitment to protect the acquired rights of women and to work towards its supporting and development and to take measures to eliminate violence against women. It also runs counter to the requirements of Chapter 11 paragraph 02 of the Organic Law No 58 of 2017 of 11 August, 2017 on the elimination of violence against women, which states: “The public and private media are sensitizing the risks of violence against women and ways to combat and prevent it. It seeks to form media workers to deal with violence against women in respect of ethics, human rights and equality, and prevents publicity and the broadcast of media material containing stereotypes, scenes, statements or actions that offend the image of women, or that are devoted to violence against women or those who are under the risk of violence. This is done by all means and media. The audio-audiovisual liaison body shall take measures and penalties as required by law to address the abuses set forth in the preceding paragraph of this chapter”.

Conclusion

These decisions, despite their importance, seem inadequate to address the escalating hate speech in our country, especially after the publication in June 2018 of the Individual Liberties and Equality Committee report, which has mobilized many media to fight and propagate false ideas and its contents. If we were to be reassured for the intervention of HAICA with audio media and we became “patient people,” what about electronic and paper media? Reports from civil society organizations are only to draw attention and point to breaches with a confident finger, but they do not have the power to intervene and deter. What about cybercrime too, we are currently stuck in a web of violence and hate without having a law that punishes those who incite it. The Electronic Crime Bill remained on the shelf without enacting, and even the only version published by the 2015 Nawah site did not refer either to hate speech. We need a law that addresses such speeches, but we also need to understand the boundaries between hate speech and freedom of expression, as hate speech can be used as an argument for restraint and repression or to place a certain category of people above criticism and accountability. This is already the case with anti-Semitism laws that are used to criminalize critics of the Zionist entity. Working to combat hate speech in the media should not be confined to laws and procedures, but should go much further, how can we talk about media that respects freedoms.

14- On June 28, 2019, the Council of the Independent Supreme Commission for Audiovisual Communication decided to shed a 50,000-dinar financial fine on the Tunisian Hiwar channel, with a value of 50,000 dinars, without re-broadcasting on the portion of the offense that was part of the «Sami Al-Fihri Idea» program that aired on March 30, 2019, and pulling it from the official website of the channel and from all its social media channels, due to the violation of human dignity and private life that was included in the episode in order to settle personal differences. Sami al-Fihri, presenter of the program, and Ziyad al-Makki, presenter of the «Stagyar» paragraph, directed sarcastic questions to the episode’s singer Ayman Lasek, who had a special relationship with the artist Aisha Atieh, such as «Is it true that you tried to kiss her but you collided with her seductive forehead, and you were wounded and had to perform surgical sutures?» Or, «What did you like the most about her character or her big forehead, as if she was covering her character...
and think a little bit before passing news and events when we are talking about media that make false concepts and do not know what the editorial meeting means, and we are talking about journalists who suffer because of their material circumstances, and we are talking about the time of the “imposters” and “clowns.” The media feed from the mines of hatred toward the other.

We are in case of an eternal war against this other one, we carry a distorted images of this other who is a project that might be of being subject to stereotyping and hate speech. This way of thinking is nothing but the consequence of an authoritarian regime that has huge arms and machines that want to create similar copies that run like flocks, eat and think, talk, sit, and dream in the same way.