



www.chuka.ac.ke library@chuka.ac.ke

HATE SPEECH IN THE CREATION OF SOCIO-POLITICAL DOMINANCE IN KENYAN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Peter, C.A.^{1*}, Muriungi, P.K.² and Mukuthuria, M.³

Chuka University, P. O. Box 109-60400, Chuka, Kenya

*Correspondence: atienorugendo@gmail.com

Citation: Peter, C.A., Muriungi, P.K and Mukuthuria, M (2017). Hate Speech in The Creation of Socio-Political Dominance in Kenyan Parliamentary Debates.” In: Isutsa, D.K. and Githae, E.W. *Proceedings of the Third Chuka University International Research Conference held in Chuka University, Chuka, Kenya from 26th to 28th October, 2016*.438-455 pp

ABSTRACT

Speech can vary in meaning and implication. It is generally intended to be communicative but it can sometimes fail to do so. Speech can become something more than a vehicle for the communication of propositional knowledge. Speakers can manipulate language to evoke the emotions of recipients, hence becoming “damaging speech” as opposed to speech that does not evoke negative emotions. What is said or written can have devastating effects on an individual and the society at large. There are aspects of text that should be incorporated for it to be considered acceptable. The objective of the study was: To identify and discuss hate speech as a linguistic strategy used by parliamentarians in the creation of socio-political dominance. The study also analysed language used in debates in the national assembly by identifying hate speech as a linguistic strategy. Descriptive research design was used. Sample texts were studied using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis theory. This theory looked at how the society is moulded by language that shows various power relationships. Qualitative data was collected using a guiding card to identify utterances that had the potential of being classified as hate speech. The study identified language that created dominance and discussed hate speech as a strategy used in the utterances. It analyses hate speech in the debates as captured in the Hansard. The research found that hate speech was used by speakers to create dominance in the debates.

Keywords: *Hate speech, Ideology, Political Dominance, Discourse Strategies.*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a group of ideas that are arranged in a way of thinking which can be in textual form or verbal communication (Lupton, 1992). It is a powerful tool that can be manipulated by the writer or the speaker to suit his need. It can be used to hide meanings or distort facts (Brock- Utne and Garbo, 2009). Language is integral to the construction of categories that show identity and differences, (Foucault, 1972). An important characteristic of language is that it is not merely concerned with written language but also with

spoken language. The latter gets more emphasis, Manipulation of discourse is much more pronounced in speech than in other forms of language. (Palmer, 2004). An utterance shows the situation, event and act in which it is performed, (Hymes, 1972). A speech situation is an instance of communication that has, as a prerequisite, a speaker, an utterance and a hearer who interprets the utterance. On the other hand, a speech act is an utterance that has a performative function in language and communication. Such functions include promising, ordering, greeting, warning, inviting and congratulating. Speech has the advantage of instant effect on the listener and hate can easily be spread using this code.

Hate speech attacks a person or group on many aspects of life including on the basis of race, religion, gender and sexual orientation. It is also speech that inflicts emotional damage and contains inflammatory comments meant to arouse anger in other individuals to cause severe social dislocation and damage. Hate speech can take an explicit or implicit form. This can be done by using utterances that are directly hateful or where the speaker uses indirect ways of spreading hatred. Parliament is a privileged house and the members enjoy immunity and protection against many actions, including utterances in the course of a member's legislative duties. In Kenya the Members of Parliament enjoy these privileges. With the repeal of Article 2A of the old Constitution and the promulgation of the new Constitution of Kenya in the year 2010, this freedom became evident (Habwe, 2010).

The parliamentarians enjoy this especially in the precincts of the National Assembly. This liberty provides a conducive environment for hate speech to thrive. This was a major contributor to the spread of animosity that led to the post-election violence between 2007 and 2008 in Kenya (Okwengu, 2010; KNCHR, 2007). Since people's lives revolve around their ethnic groups, politicians have been quick to retreat into their tribal cocoons in times of problems. This study will look at the discourse characteristics of hate speech in the Kenyan Parliamentary proceedings as recorded in the Hansard. It is the verbatim record of proceedings in the National Assembly. Hansard is a publication named after Thomas Curson Hansard, an early printer of the Parliamentary proceedings.

The study looked at extracts from Parliamentary debates conducted in Kenya between 1992 and 2010. This was a period of many reforms in the country which included the repeal of Section 2A (of the second constitution after the country got its independence) that changed Kenya from a *de jure* one party state and introduced multi-party system in the politics of the nation. This brought about freedom of speech. The study analysed the speeches used during debates in the Kenyan National Assembly between 1992 and 2010. This is a period when MPs enjoyed great political freedom in expressing their views. The research identified and discussed hate speech in the Hansard.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ideology

An ideology is a set of beliefs which individuals or groups base their actions. A certain ethical set of ideals of a social group that explains how society should work. Political ideologies are concerned with many different aspects of society including power allocation. Ideologies are frameworks for organizing the social cognitions that are shared by members of a group. In a discourse, participants engage each other as individual or groups. In such situations, there can be domination by one group and resistance to this by the other (van Dijk, 2005). Players especially in a political discourse will tend to portray themselves as upright and good while placing the others in negative light. Ideology refers to how language accrues socio-political meaning (Kroskrity, 2000). It organizes and enables all cultural beliefs and practices as well as the power relations that emerge. Ideology emerges from social actors' habitual practice. It refers to shared representation of people in a social setting (van Dijk, 2010).

Social and political aspects are regulated by ideology (Jorgensen and Philips, 2002). Ideology in this sense brings about identity formation which contributes to socio-political dominance. This is cemented gradually and if this ideology is spread to cover broader areas and is shared by more people it becomes a belief (van

Dijk, 1995). Ideology played out in Kenyan parliament during debates as MPs reorganized themselves into cells that identified who belonged to which party or group. It brought about the categorization of MPs, causing identity creation. The activities that each group participated in were directed by the ideology that they ascribed to. This affected their views and how they related with group members and others from opposing sides.

Ideology can be either positive or negative (van Dijk, 2005). This usually depends on who is making the observation and what the individual's perspective is. Language in parliament during debate is political and in Kenya after the repeal of section 2A, there was government and opposition side. The members' discuss issues based on which side of the divide they belong. This political discourse almost always places government and opposition on antagonistic fronts. The government would strive to defend its stand on an issue while opposition would strive to criticize and question government in an attempt to play the oversight role and speak for the neglected people. Ideology affects the structure of language such as speech presentation (van Dijk, 1995). A member of parliament from either side would have his personal view influence the way their team members argue on an issue in the August house. It is through the discussions in parliament that the groups' ideology is brought out.

Discourse Strategies

Discourse is an institutionalized way of speaking that determines not only what we say and how we say it, but also what we do not say (Yasemin, 2010). Discourse signals are used in making interactions, control unbalanced use of politeness strategies, speech procedures, use of proverbs, evaluative accounts and explicit declarations of power and dominant informational structure amongst others (Uchenna, 2012). These should be studied in order to expose the hidden agenda and ideological bias, (Ilie, 2010c). In so doing one can examine different interpersonal positioning, rules and practices in parliamentary discourse. Politicians are sustained by persuasive or manipulative use of language. Specific discourse forms can be resolved into a play of pre- significations as opposed to overgeneralising form of analysis (Hook, 2005). In the present study, investigations focused on how the speakers used such manipulative language that was actualised in discourse elements such as hate speech and (de) legitimisation.

Concept of Hate Speech

It is argued that there is no universally accepted definition of hate speech, (Hamm, 1994). But according to The Collins English Dictionary (10th edition, 2009), hate speech is a speech that attacks a person or group on the basis of race, religion, gender or sexual orientation. It is a speech disparaging a racial, sexual or ethnic group or a member of such a group. Hate speech is further defined as speech that inflicts emotional damage and contains inflammatory comments meant to incite other individuals to cause severe social dislocation and damage (Becker et al., 2000). Hate speech is any propaganda of war and advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred (ICCPR, 1966). According to the Council of Europe's Community of Ministers, hate speech covers all forms of expressions which spread, incite promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia and other forms of hatred based on intolerance. Hate speech is that utterance that is designed to promote hatred on the basis of race, religion, ethnicity or national origin (Rosenfeld, 2003).

For the purpose of the proposed research; hate speech will be defined as any utterance that attacks a person or group of people on the basis of race, religion, gender or sexual orientation. It should be examined in the following terms; the purpose pursued by the speaker, the content of the expression and the context in which the expression is given. It is important to look at the expression and see whether the speaker's intention is to show racist, tribal or superiority ideas, or to give information to the public. In content, there should be a distinction between statements of facts and value judgment when examining the utterance. The context in which an utterance is made, should address the social status of the speaker, the potential impact of the speech and the status of the targeted person.

Purpose of Speech

It is important to identify the subject of a speech so as to understand it. Every communication must have a topic that it is addressing. Communication should have a purpose as a significant feature and the subject which it is addressing (Mudd and Sillars, 1986). Linguistic discourse is divided into theme and goal. The former is the subject or idea the speaker wants to convey to the audience. This is usually the speaker's message. The goal is the purpose, what the speaker wants to achieve by conveying the idea. This is important because during debates in Parliament, a speaker may want to say something but the way he puts it can express his intended goal which may be, to spread hate.

The choice of a speech subject is never the speaker's alone. The audience needs must play a part in subject selection. The debates in parliament involve some occasion; this brings the members together in a session with a speaker and an audience. The occasion will determine what the speaker intends to pass across to the listeners. The hate speaker wants to give the audience ideas which are organized and supported. In return the speaker expects some reaction from the audience. Speech can be used to persuade, entertain and inform. In all, spoken words, which are the interest of this study, are used.

Spoken and Written Discourse

Human beings are linguistic beings and need language in their everyday communication so that they can understand themselves and their immediate environment and the rest of the world (Murray, 2011). Communication can involve the use of words. The words used in communication, whether spoken or written can be interpreted in many ways. They are powerful tools that can injure or cure (Baez, 2002; Obiakor et al., 2007). Spoken language has the effect of immediacy. One can read the paralinguistic features that the speaker uses and these can help them gauge what the speaker means. The written text lacks this. It is possible to read and re-read a text to get a clearer message. At the same time, 'function' words have the least possibility of being manipulated to distort or clarify meaning by a speaker. These words carry the least lexical information. They are words whose main role is to make the speech grammatical. It is very easy for the writer or speaker to consciously control them. Content words carry the meaning in a sentence. Therefore these words can be manipulated into hate speech instead of serving their primary purpose which is, to communicate.

Environment for Hate Speech

In the 1980s and before, divisions in terms of ethnicity were not given a lot of prominence and the mass media such as newspapers and radio broadcasts, never mentioned tribal affiliation (Hirsch, 2013). But this trend shifted in the 1990s. The communities that used to live in relatively peaceful environments turned against each other. There arose discrimination on the basis of tribe, religion and sexual orientation. This has led to hate speech which continues to spread (Murray, 2011). Hate speech has taken new forms and avenues. These include the Internet, the media and even the entertainment industry where we have song, drama and dance which can be coined to express hatred. It is arguable that technological advancement has boosted the proliferation of hate speech because, unlike in the past when hate speech had incidents such as verbal and physical attacks on minority groups, hate speech has taken new platforms; the Facebook, twitter, YouTube and blogs among others. Further, the National Assembly is also a likely avenue for hate speech owing to the privileges accorded to Members of Parliament. In order for hate speech to flourish, there must be a source and an audience, or a hate speaker and a hate listener, (Murray, 2011).

This concept of hate speech targets people or groups that a speaker considers to be inferior based on the earlier mentioned characteristics. It is a form of discrimination where one needs to look at communication action and validity claims. The latter represents; the claim to truth, to rightness of norms and values and to the speaker's sincerity. These are seen in hate speech as the claim to inequality (in the objective world), the claim to the rightness of discrimination against groups and the claim of a sincere hater towards the targeted group, (Gelber, 2002).

Hate speech occurs in many forms such as text messages, radio broadcasts, leaflets and speeches and can have various effects on the listeners (Hirsch, 2013). In parliament, hate speech can be identified in speeches during the debates in the house. It is believed that hate speech played a major role in the eruption of violence during political campaigns and elections of 1992, 1997 and 2007 in Kenya (Bayne, 2008; EU 2008, IREC 2008: KNCHR 2007). For this reason, there is need to study hate speech before, during and after elections, and to scrutinize the leaders' use of language. Do they use language that brings reconciliation or language that stokes violence? This study intends to look at the language used by leaders in a formal setup and then study the content of their debates.

Identification of Hate Speech

It is not easy to identify hate speech (Weber, 2009.) Hate speech can be concealed in statements which, on the surface, may appear to be plain and harmless (Weber, 2009 and Yasemin, 2010). A speaker may quote certain words used elsewhere or make use of metaphors that the listener has to decipher. Hate speech can be identified to be any careless or intentionally hurtful statements. Thus, any speech that criticizes another person's race, religion, gender, ethnicity, appearance, class, physical or mental capabilities or sexual preference can be identified as hate speech (Dershowitz, 1992). Hate speech is epithets, ethnic slurs, insulting language, name calling, derogatory references, inciteful speech, language that marginalizes, language that denigrates- criticizes unfairly or insults, use of dehumanizing language such as referring to persons as weeds, spots and animals (Hirsch, 2013). The researcher will use these to guide in developing a card which will assist in identification of hate speech in the extracts from parliamentary proceedings.

Freedom of Expression

Freedom of expression is a state of being allowed to say what you want to say. This includes the rights to express oneself the way they feel. The right should be enjoyed so long as they do not infringe on the rights of others and are not malicious, false and seditious (Harrower, 2007). The first amendment prohibits government officials from suppressing speech. It is not clear where the line is between hate speech and freedom of expression (Volkova, Silvestri, and Lopez, 2001). People often manipulate the freedom of speech to suit their interests and in the process inflict damage or hurt other people with their words. Hate speech holds important functional values that form the basis of common law which protects society (Cowan, Resendez, Marshal and Quist, 2002). Free speech on the other hand, gives an opportunity for candid discussions. It is also an instrument that has contributed to development and advancement of minority groups by allowing open discussions on issues. Free speech affects different people in varied ways. For example, anti-gay language is seen by the gay as hateful while advocating gay lifestyles is also seen by Christians as being hateful (Dershowitz, 1992.) Information about contraception would be considered as hate speech by some people, whose faith discourages the use of contraceptives as a family planning method. In all these expressions, new ideas are spread and alternative viewpoints are raised through free speech (Cowan et al, 2002). Prohibition of hate speech is a limitation of freedom of expression. Freedom of speech should be enjoyed by all, but it can be limited to a point when it is necessary to protect other values such as human dignity (Stakic, 2011). According to Mill (1989), governments have no right to prescribe opinions and to determine what the citizens are allowed to hear. People have a right to do whatever they want as long as it does not infringe on the rights of others. Freedom of expression carries special duties and responsibilities; respect of the rights and reputations of others, the protection of national security or public order, health and morals (ICCPR, 1966).

Individual freedom should be inco-operating protection from oppressive popular opinion referred to as tyranny of the majority and the government authority. Speech should be accorded special protection from government regulation because expressions and thoughts should be viewed on the same platform. It should be private and not regulated (Riley, 1998).

Hate Speech and Parliament Proceedings

Parliament has popularly elected leaders who have legitimately been chosen by the people through a democratic process. When such leaders speak, they make their electorate accept the discourse that they use and it influences the latter's actions. This can give way to wicked cultural insulting remarks that could damage and frighten certain groups of people (Hirsch, 2013). Parliamentary debates have a more immediate and powerful effect on the listeners. Although the speeches made in parliament are directly meant for a specific audience, it is nevertheless clear that all transactions and discussions in the house are made by representatives of the people. Their utterances are said on behalf of the people. On many occasions some speeches in the National Assembly have not augured well with the public. Hate speech has been known to lead to social rage and hatred in political rallies and on media talk shows. Arguably, such feelings could be transferred to other people.

A speech such as the following on discrimination can cause a lot of animosity:

... sometimes, during Jomo Kenyatta's time, we had those problems. Worse ones were yet to be experienced during the Moi regime and, of course, the worst came early this year. That is because of one tribe discriminating against the others. (Hansard, 2008: 1653).

This statement is bound to elicit negative feelings against the one tribe that appears to be favoured and there is a likelihood that the members of the other tribes could gang up against the one tribe.

Hate speech can arise from falsehoods, flawed argumentation, divisive language and dehumanizing metaphors that are directed towards specific vulnerable groups (O'Grady, 2009). This is evident in some of the debates in parliament. In some instances the hate in the speeches is not even concealed. The hate speaker does so openly and does not use other aspects of linguistics such as implicature. In the following extract, a member of parliament is pointing an accusing finger at the government's recruitment procedures. The member intends to arouse some perception, that there is favouritism involved and members of a certain region are given the rosy ministries and positions. This could easily lead to despondency and disdain towards the region where the president comes from, by the members from other regions which feel left out.

A casual glance at the government records shows disparities. Look at the office of the President's staffing. People from one particular region took charge of very good ministries, very powerful ministries, parastatals and departments. Ministries which are heavily funded are given to people from one particular region (Hansard, 2007: 3831). Parliament proceedings are productive forces in a conflict. During question time, the members have an opportunity to ask for clarification, make claims and allegations over what has been said by either a member or even a non-member of the house. Members of Parliament enjoy the privilege to express themselves freely and sometimes without weighing the words they use. More often than not the members go overboard in their contributions. They use language that may have greater ramifications than the intended information. The debates, being verbal, have a more immediate and powerful impact on the listeners as compared to written discourse. This is because the listener can react on the spot to what has been said.

Prior to the 2008 US elections, it was noted that there was political discourse that was laced with hate speech which begun to resemble the situation in Kenya during the 2007/2008 campaigns and election period. This hate speech targeted President Obama negatively. There was use of puns and word plays like 'Osama/ Obama/ Nobama (Hirsch, 2013). Obama is the president of the United States; Osama was the leader of the terrorist group called Al-Qaeda. This may be seen to mean that the president and Osama have a similar characteristic, which is why they follow it with Nobama. The last word is used to mean that there is no Obama, that is, he should not be elected. The whites used these words to campaign against Obama. The placing of such words together in a sort of rhyme is tantamount to spreading hate. Hate speech may not always be presented in an obvious way. It can be hidden or implied. We can see the morphological implication in the words formed. By changing or replacing one unit in the morpheme we change the word and its meaning hence contributing to negativity in what we are saying.

The Power in Language

The context of what is said matters because the same thing said in different contexts can be either acceptable or not. Freedom of speech should be approached as a value detached and independent from the actual content of speech (Chomsky, 1980). Expressions such as ‘kumbavu’- a foolish person and ‘mavi ya kuku’- chicken excrement, used by the former president of Kenya, honourable Mwai Kibaki, come out as a touch of humour but if someone else said them, they would be considered abusive and would elicit negative feelings and reactions. This is because they are actually words of insolence. Politicians, and other people who have the opportunity of speaking to a big audience, can take advantage to express their personal attitudes. Language at this instance can be manipulated easily at the whims of the speaker.

Divisive language, deixis, looks at word choice and how rhetorical effects are used to appeal to listeners. Deixis in linguistics refers to words or phrases that require contextual information so that the listener can grasp denotational meaning or understand it. In a statement, there is need to study deictic terms that need contextual information such as time, speaker and listener, location and third party. Deictic words point at specific persons, places, situations, values ideology and group (Lyons, 1977).

The power of particular utterances is in the context in which they are spoken. A harmless statement in the midst of tension can cause violence and hatred that would otherwise not be experienced during peaceful times (Hirsch, 2013). Inflammatory speech during the election campaign period was responsible for the violence that followed the 2007 election in Kenya (Odinga, 2013). Speeches can be used to indoctrinate the masses to take certain positions (Hirsch, 2013). In such instances language can be used to give dehumanizing images to meet this purpose. If language is used in this way, it should be a pointer to an imminent eruption of violence caused by speech.

Political Dominance

Power is not just a negative concept of coercion or repression but it can be a productive and positive force (Gaventa, 2003). A group with more power is considered as the dominant one and it may control others in specific situation or domains. Since action is controlled by the mind, the dominant group strives to influence other people and this gives them power over the dominated group (Essed, 1991). Group based dominance is produced and maintained through discrimination at various levels which is integrated and co-ordinated by legitimizing ideology (Pratto, Sidanius and Levin, 2006).

Nyewusira and Nweke (2012) expose that transactional nature of party politics affect democratic governance at local government level where there arose a system of support of policymaking opposed to rules, ethics and views of democratic governance. Overt statements of power and dominant interpretive frameworks are aspects of discursive signals used by elders to mark interactional power (Uchenna, 2012). This compares with implicit explanation used by speakers in parliament to respond to questions. This aspect of discursive formation is discussed under mode. Dominance can be conveyed by non-verbal cues such as body language (Amos, 2013). People knowingly develop and use this as a technique to exert control over others. MPs use this aspect consciously to achieve their desired goals. Dominance is also created through other discourse elements; stereotypes, implicature, hate speech, verbosity and presupposition. There has been a ‘linguistic turn’ (Stibbe, 2001) where there is a social principle that looks at how language is given a dominant role in social aspects (Fairclough, 1992). Politics is a game of power and dominance. It is argued that power is a force that circulates in a web of social interactions between individuals who exercise as well as undergo power. Foucault (1980: 98) says:

Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. Not only do individuals do circulate through its thread, they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of articulation. Thus, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its point of application.

It is the argument of this thesis that members of parliament see themselves truly as the elements just aforementioned; elements of power. They always want to be felt not only by the people they serve, but also by their fellow parliamentarians. That is why; therefore, they will use all that it takes for that dominance to be felt. This includes the language they use on the floor of the house. It is this language that this thesis sought to analyse. The Language that parliamentarians use during debates may, at times, be considered 'unparliamentary'.

According to Westminster system such language includes, among others, hate speech, profanity, dishonesty and the like (Pilkinton, 1999). Legislators are however protected from persecution and legal actions because they enjoy parliamentary immunity. On legal proceedings against a member of parliament, chapter 8 of the Constitution of Kenya states:

No civil or criminal proceedings shall be constituted against a member for words spoken before, or written in a report to, the assembly or a committee, or by reason of any other matter, brought by him therein by petition, bill, resolution, motion or otherwise.

By studying parliamentary discourse, it is hoped that the various strategies used by members of parliament would be revealed to the general populace since, in the house, members are not always objective in their contributions. Rather, they tend to incline toward the position taken by their side of the divide; There are always opposing sides even when the members debate legislative propositions (Bayley, 2004). This study focuses on the language used in Kenyan parliamentary debates to create socio-political dominance. While studying parliamentary debates, the role of context in the discourse is undisputable. Though parliaments are bound by strict rules of operation (mentioned earlier), the role of the context of culture and history is indisputable (Bayley, 2004.) The Kenyan Parliamentary discourse has intrigues that stretch into the early history of this country. On the eve of Independence in 1963, there emerged two strong contending sides among the politicians who were in the frontline of taking the helm of leadership from the colonial masters; Kenya African Union (KANU) and Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU). The alignment has polarised Kenya since the formative stages of the nation and its effects have hounded the country with undesirable outcomes, including the Post-Election Violence (PEV) which rocked the country after the 2007 General Elections. This is argued out in the progression of this thesis. In June 1982 Kenya was officially declared a One Party State. There followed a dark period in the history of Kenya; a period that many Kenyans would rather forget; a period of unfathomable oppression. Not even politicians were spared. None would dare express their opinion. That was an era that saw many underground political activities and movements. A lot of political dissent was expressed clandestinely.

There were many detentions without trial. The parliamentary debates of these years were full of court poetry; language was used with an intention of praising and pleasing the government that was in place. The then State party was commonly referred to as 'Baba na Mama' (father and mother). Every word uttered revolved around the goodness of the party. The situation suddenly changed toward the end of 1991. The clamour for the repeal of this section bore fruit. In 1992, Kenya saw the repeal of section 2A that ended the one party rule in the country and saw the beginning of multi-partiism. Multi-partiism ushered in a new era of unprecedented freedoms in Kenya. This is evident in all spheres of life leave alone parliament; members could speak out their mind without fear of being detained the moment they stepped out of the precincts of the august house. The current study sought to find out how parliamentarians used language in their supremacy war for political dominance.

Parliamentary language should be courteous, good tempered, and use moderate among other qualities. Language that does not have such qualities is considered un-parliamentary. It uses offensive, provocative or threatening approaches. Personal attack, insults and obscene language or words are not allowed. In Belgium as well as Ireland, a member is allowed to say what he or she wishes because they consider it necessary as a democratic state. They have absolute freedom of speech when in parliament. The Canadian members enjoy freedom of expression but certain words and phrases are prohibited. Members avoid using

such words to describe others (MP) because they are un-parliamentary (Flynn, 2007). Un-parliamentary language is prohibited in Hong Kong and India. The Indian parliament discourages the use of certain words and phrases and has gone further by publishing a book of words that are un-parliamentary. Similarly the New Zealand parliament has a list of words and phrases that are seen as unbecoming and insulting. Ugandan parliament members are given an opportunity to explain a speech that could have been misunderstood, to exonerate his or her character and conduct if it has been maligned (Kiwanuka, 2012). In the neighbouring country, Tanzania, Parliament proceeding is conducted in Swahili and members are expected to conduct themselves with dignity and moderation (Wekuja, 2004).

As hinted already, dominance is a term associated with authority, control and command actions and it may be exhibited in an optimistic or harmful way, depending on the intention of the speaker and the purpose for which the dominance is displayed. In politics, dominance is a battle of supremacy by the real or imaginary opposing side. This can be conveyed through prominence, positioning and determination to dominate interactions. The parliamentary procedure of having only one member on the floor at a particular time is not only a show of superiority but also physical dominance. The MP, towers over the seated colleagues. Dominance is thus perceived in positioning of the member's physique (Amos, 2013.)

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA)

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) theory informed the study. FDA is patterned way of thinking which can be identified in textual and verbal communications and be located in wider social structure (Lupton, 1992). Parliaments are different in terms of culture, historical development and power relations and it is these variations that influence the way language is used in the parliament (Jakaza, 2013); so, using different theoretical frameworks on different data gives important insights on parliamentary discourse. FDA is a method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) that is applied to texts. A CDA is usually based on power; which is social power of groups or institutions. There is power if individuals are able to control the actions and thinking of others. The assumption is that those who are powerful have privileged access to scarce resources such as knowledge and information (Lukes, 1986; Wrong, 1979). FDA can be used where the text has been assessed and confirmed to represent the required contents.

Widdowson (2004) characterises CDA as: "... type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduce and resisted by text and the social and political context." Discourse is language; that is, its structure, functions and patterns in use. This study employed Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, a form of CDA, as espoused by Michel Foucault. It finds its roots from the critical theory of language which views language as a social phenomenon. This theory has not been used to analyse parliamentary debates in Kenya. FDA is a critical concept often used in politically oriented studies. It is preferred by scholars who are looking for a system that tries to explain the political implications of discourse (Batstone, 1995). During debates in parliament, language is used to create identities and also to manipulate the listeners. FDA is an analytical approach that studies primarily the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context (van Dijk, 2003). The present study examined how language was used to create dominance through coercion and other strategies.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a qualitative research design. This was appropriate in the study of human behaviour because it uncovers deeper understanding of such behavior (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). This method allowed the researcher to gather the required information. The methodology helps a researcher to collect data in the form of words (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The target population for the study was the speeches made by the parliamentarians between 1992 and 2010 in the National Assembly. The research investigated the kind of language the MPs used during debates in parliament that created socio – political identities and dominance.

Data Collection Procedure

Data was collected from extracts of parliamentary debates in Kenya. This information was from the Hansard. Relevant excerpts were identified using a guiding card. Hate speech as a strategy of dominance creation was examined.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research problem was that politically elected leaders use the immunity that they enjoy to manipulate language to create dominance. Members of Parliament used explicit and implicit forms of hate speech to coerce others to support, embrace or reject some people and to incite others against the establishment. Using language in this way created socio- political dominance. The findings of this study are presented alongside the three research questions. In their endeavour to create social political dominance the members of parliament in Kenya used hate speech as pragmatic strategies. There were many instances where MPs used inflammatory statements that were offensive and provocative.

During debates, some of the speeches made had the ability of inflicting emotional damage and also contained inflammatory comments meant to incite other individuals. Hate speech was evident in the forms of expressions used by the speakers. Such speech spread animosity and incited the listeners. The following are excerpts in which such language was used to exhibit socio- political dominance.

Utterance 1

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, look at the situation obtaining at the Kenya Ports Authority (KPA). There is a Managing Director who did a commendable job there – Mr. Brown Ondego. He was removed and replaced with another docile one, merely because there was pressure coming from that region we are not recognising ability and capability! **(Hansard: 12th September 2007).**

This utterance was on the motion on imbalance in the distribution of public resources. The following is the classification of the utterance from the guiding card..

Elements of Hate Speech	Present/ not present
1. Speech that solicits disdain against a person/ group because of their ethnicity.	✓
2. Speech that encourages ethnicity.	✓
3. Incitement to hatred against a group of persons defined in terms of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender and religion.	✓
4. Use of cultural stereotypes.	✓
5. Any form of expression regarded as offensive to racial, ethnic and religious groups.	✓
6. Speech that promotes discrimination on the basis of tribe, colour, ethnic group, religious group.	✓
7. Use of abusive, negative and insulting language.	✓
8. Ridiculing of another person on basis of ethnicity, race or religious belief.	✓
9. Use of threatening, abusive words or behaviour to stir ethnic hatred	✓

The utterance here refers to the leadership of KPA. It is on the apparent wrong choice of the leadership of the corporation. There is a tribal and regional element to it. There is the use of diminutive language that shows bias against people from a certain region. The idea of incompetence comes up. There was a wrong choice based on “our” person. The topic here is the speech that solicits disdain against the group from certain regions because of their ethnicity. The speaker is inciting the others against a group. This utterance emboldens ethnicity.

Utterance 2

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, look at the situation obtaining at the Kenya airports Authority (KAA). Eng. Mwongera, who actually fits in the job of being the managing Director of KAA-, I would

imagine- is the Chairman of that Corporation! A former priest is the Managing Director. It is those kinds of scenarios that we would want to see corrected. **(Hansard: 12th September 2007)**

The utterance was a debate on the motion on distribution of public resources. Categories:

Elements of Hate Speech	Present/ not present
1. Speech that encourages religious/ group violence.	✓
2. Incitement to hatred against a group of persons defined in terms of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, religion and sexual orientation.	✓
3. Any form of expression regarded as offensive to racial, ethnic and religious groups.	✓
4. Speech that promotes discrimination on the basis of tribe, colour, ethnic group, religious group.	✓

The speaker in the utterance strives to draw everyone’s attention to the irregular ways that government distributes employment opportunities. Those in power use the position of authority to give jobs to their relatives and friends who may be unqualified for the positions. The speaker uses this opportunity to incite others to rise against these acts. In doing this, he uses language that is abusive, derogative and hateful. He belittles the calling of priesthood. The speaker takes advantage of the chance to delegitimize the government since he is in the opposition.

Utterance 3

Mr. Maore:... So when the language is used that we all share the responsibility of bringing down the economy, I say no!... Today what has been happening for the last several years is that very many people are getting rich from the DOD after supplying air.
 Mr An’gwenyi:...Is the honourable member from some part of Meru in order...” **(Hansard: 12th September 2007).**

The utterance was a debate on the rampant spread of corruption in the government. Categories:

Elements of Hate Speech	Present/not present
1. Speech that solicits disdain against a person/ group because of their ethnicity.	✓
2. Speech that encourages ethnicity.	✓
3. Incitement to hatred against a group of persons defined in terms of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, religion and sexual orientation.	✓
4. Use of cultural stereotypes.	✓
5. Any form of expression regarded as offensive to racial, ethnic and religious groups.	✓
6. Speech that promotes discrimination on the basis of tribe, colour, ethnic group, religious group.	✓
7. Use of abusive, negative and insulting language.	✓
8. Ridiculing of another person on basis of ethnicity, race or religious belief.	✓
9. Use of threatening, abusive words or behaviour towards a group to stir up ethnic hatred.	✓

In utterance, the speech has words of loathing for some group. One speaker uses offensive and provocative language. The discourse conveys to the front the awareness of regionalism, the speaker strives to undermine the Meru people by presenting Meruland as an area where that does not create interest and so people do not aspire to go there.

The utterance was an appreciation of the presidential address. The speech has words of hate for some group. One speaker uses offensive and provocative language. The discourse brings to the fore the awareness

of regionalism, the speaker strives to undermine the Meru people by presenting Meruland as an area that is not interesting and inspiring. This is a diminutive reference to the area. This is further captured in his statement: *Mr. Speaker, Sir... member from some part of Meru in order...* The freedom that parliamentarians enjoy provides a conducive environment for hate speech to thrive and largely contributed to mobilizing people to spread animosity that led to the post-election violence between 2007 and 2008 in Kenya (Okwengu, 2010; KNCHR, 2007). In the utterance, the speaker uses such speech when he refers: In the statement... *from some part of Meru...* the speaker appears to look down upon the Meru region. This is a speech disparaging among other things, ethnic groups or a member of such a group. The speaker advances his dominance by using hate speech (Friedman, 2011). This can be related to who uses hate speech to derive cheap laugh by degrading an entire group of people in the following example:

Question: How was the Grand Canyon formed?

Answer: A Jew lost a nickel in a crack.

The speaker in this utterance also degrades Meru area and by extension its people. Whereas Friedman (2011) pokes fun at the Jews, the speaker in this utterance is forthright and refers to the region as if it is not of importance. Such a statement is a way of displaying the speaker's socio-political dominance.

Utterance 4

Mr. Ojode: ...What I was saying is that heavily funded Ministries are given to people from a particular region. That disparity is what we want to rationalise. ...Ministry of Education alone, which has over 30 core functions, is headed by people from one particular region... It is worse, when the same Government is employing people who have attained the mandatory retirement age of 55 years. It is so absurd and so bad, yet the country is full of graduates from various regions...(Hansard: 12th September 2007).

The utterance was a debate on the public outcry on the nepotism that continued to thrive in the government. It was categorized as follows:

Elements of Hate Speech	Present/ not present
1. Speech that solicits disdain against a person/ group because of their ethnicity.	✓
2. Speech that encourages ethnicity.	✓
3. Incitement to hatred against a group of persons defined in terms of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, religion and sexual orientation.	✓
4. Use of cultural stereotypes.	✓
5. Any form of expression regarded as offensive to racial, ethnic and religious groups	✓
6. Speech that promotes discrimination on the basis of tribe, colour, ethnic group, religious group.	✓
7. Use of abusive, negative and insulting language.	✓
8. Ridiculing of another person on basis of ethnicity, race or religious belief.	✓
9. Use of threatening, abusive words or behaviour towards a group to stir ethnic hatred	✓

In the utterance, the language used by members of parliament during debates is a discursive act of discrimination that encourages inequalities (Gelber, 2002). In the speech, the speaker from the opposition side decries the manner in which the government is favouring people from certain communities. It uses its powers to create socio-political dominance. The speech contains expressions of hatred for some group. One speaker uses inciting and provocative language. The speech brings to the fore the idea of regionalism. It implies that the Mount Kenya region is favoured by those in power, to the disadvantage of the rest. This is hate speech, as the speaker strives to provoke the people from the areas that have not been favoured to rise up against those who have benefitted from these employments. From the guiding card, the speaker fulfils

the reference to number 1: “Speech that solicits disdain against a person/ group and encourages negative ethnicity and regional misunderstandings”.

Utterance 5

Mr. Ojode:... I wanted to appeal to the Government to take strategic steps, without victimising anybody... there was some skewed manner in which employment was done in that department...Look at the office of the President’s staffing. People from one particular region took charge of very good...which are heavily funded are given to people from one particular region...(Hansard: 12th September 2007)

The utterance was also a discussion on favourism and nepotism in employment. Categories:

Elements of Hate Speech	Present/ not present
1. Speech that solicits disdain against a person/ group because of their ethnicity.	✓
2. Speech that encourages ethnicity.	✓
3. Incitement to hatred against a group of persons defined in terms of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, religion and sexual orientation.	✓
4. Use of cultural stereotypes.	✓
5. Any form of expression regarded as offensive to racial, ethnic and religious groups.	✓
6. Speech that promotes discrimination on the basis of tribe, colour, ethnic group, religious group.	✓
7. Use of abusive, negative and insulting language.	✓
8. Ridiculing of another person on basis of ethnicity, race or religious belief.	✓
9. Use of threatening, abusive words or behaviour towards a group to stir ethnic hatred	✓

Hate speech is evident in the utterance. The utterance solicits social disdain against a group, this encourages negative ethnicity. The speech has the potential to stir up ethnic hatred. In context, there should be a distinction between statements of facts and value judgment when examining the utterance. The context in which an utterance is made, should address the social status of the speaker, the potential impact of the speech and the status of the targeted person. These circumstances influence listeners. This utterance shows how hate can be used in speech to stir up negative ethnicity. This has led to hate speech which continues to spread (Murray, 2011).

Language that exhibits socio- political dominance, targets people or groups that a speaker considers as being inferior. It is a form of discrimination where one needs to look at communication action and validity claims. The latter represents: the claim to truth, to rightness of norms and values and to the speaker’s sincerity (Gelber, 2002). These may be present in MPs language or may not be there especially if the language used is meant to coerce or manipulate the listeners.

SUMMARY

The paper presents the backdrop of the study which is premised on the following research objective; to identify and discuss hate speech as a linguistic strategy used by parliamentarians in the creation of socio-political dominance. There is a detailed literature review regarding the study in which the following areas have been discussed; Ideology, concept of hate speech, purpose of speech, spoken and written discourse, environment for hate speech, identification of hate speech, freedom of expression, hate speech and parliamentary proceedings, the power in language, political dominance, discourse analysis and Foucauldian discourse analysis

CONCLUSION

This study set to examine how parliamentarians used hate speech during parliamentary debates to create socio-political dominance. Between 1992 and 2010, the Kenyan Parliament turned very vibrant as members freely enjoyed the freedom of expression especially after the repeal of the section 2A of the then Kenyan Constitution. It was evident that the ideology that the members ascribed to had a great impact on the kind of language they used during debates. They sometimes went overboard to create socio-political dominance. Evidently, the government and the opposition were always on an antagonistic stance in their response to the questions. The members' contributions were mainly geared towards power control over the weaker side. The MPs change their ideology depending on whether they are in government or parliament at the given time. Consequently, the contributions in parliament are more inclined towards dominance rather than focus on the matter at hand.

REFERENCES

- Amos, J.A. (2013). *Body language and hierarchy or dominance*.
- Baez, R. (2002). *Affirmative Action, Hate Speech and Tenure*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Batstone, R. (1995). *Grammar in discourse: Attitude and deniability*. In: G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (eds.). *Principle and practice in applied linguistics*. P. 197-213. Oxford: OUP
- Bayley, P. (2004). *The whys and wherefores of analysing parliamentary discourse*. In Bayley, P. (Ed). *Cross- Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*. P. 1- 44. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bayne, S. (2008). *Post Election Violence in Kenya: An Assessment for UK Government*. London: DFID Kenya – UK Government.
- Becker, P. J., Byers, B. and Jipson, A. (2000). 'The Contentious American Debate: The First Amendment and Internet-based Hate Speech.' In *International Review of Law Computers and Technology*. Vol.14 No. 1: Cyber-crimes, Cyber speech and Cyber liberties.
- Brock-Utne, B., and Garbo, G. (2009). *Language and Power: Implications of Language for Peace and Development*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.
- Chomsky, N. (1980). *Some Elementary Comments on the Right of Freedom of Expression*. Preface to Fourisson, R. *Memoire en defense*. Paris
- Cowan, G., Resendez, M., Marshal, E. and Quist, R.(2002). 'Hate Speech and Constitutional Protection: Priming Values of Equality and Freedom.' In *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol 58- issue 2, page 247-263. .
- Dershowitz, A. M. (1992). "What is Hate Speech." Boston: The Bryan Times.
- Essed, P.J.M. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- EU, Election Observation Mission, (2008). *Kenya: Final Report General Elections 27 December*. European Union.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Flynn, C. (2007). *Debating tutorial*. Ireland: Ardfinnan CO. Tipperray.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/ knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings (1972-1977)*. Colin Gordon (ed) New York (NY): Pantheon Books.
- Friedman, T. (2011). *Language: Origin of hate, "why Thomas friedman hates Israel"* New York: Newt Mitt.
- Gaventa, J. (2003). *Power after Lukes: A review of the literature*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Gelber, K. (2002). *Speaking Back: The Free Speech Verses Hate Speech Debate*. New York. John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Habwe, J. H. (2010). 'Dialogue Drama in Kenyan Political Speeches and Pragmatic Implications.' In: *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 19(3): 165-180.
- Hamm, M.S. (1994). 'Hate Crime: International Perspectives on Causes and Control Cincinnati, OH'. In *Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences: Anderson Publications*.
- Hansard Publications (2007). *Parliamentary Records*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

- Harrower, T. 2007. *Inside Reporting: A Practical Guide to the Craft of Journalism*. NY: McGrawHill.
- Hirsch, S. (2013). *Putting Hate Speech in Context: Observations of Speech, Power and Violence in Kenya*. "Speech, Power and Violence: Hate Speech and the Political Crisis in Kenya. George Mason University.
- Hook, D. (2005). Genealogy, discourse effective history: Foucault and the work of critique. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2(1):3-31.
- Hymes, D.H. (1972) "On Communicative Competence" In Pride, J. and Holmes, J. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ilie, C. (2010 c). Introduction: European parliaments under scrutiny: Discourse strategies and interaction practices. In Ilie, C. (ed) PP 1-28.
- Independent Review Commission (2008). *Report of the Independent Review Commission on the General Elections Held in Kenya on 27 December 2007*. Nairobi. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (1966), GA Res 2200A(XXI).
- Jakaza, E. (2013). *Appraisal and evaluation in zimbabwean parliamentary discourse and its representation in newspaper articles*. Unpublished Ph.D: Stellenbosch University.
- Jorgensen, M. and Phillips L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (2007). 'Still Behaving Badly': *Second Periodic Report of the Election- Monitoring Project*. Nairobi. Kenya National Commission on Human Rights.
- Kiwanuka, W. 2012. *Parliamentary debate in Uganda*. Uganda: Office of Clerk, Ugandan Parliament.
- Kroskrity, P. (2000). *Regimes of language Ideologies, Politics and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Lincoln, S.Y. and Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, London: Sage Publications.
- Lukes, S. (1986). *Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lupton, D. (1992). 'Discourse Analysis: A New Methodology for Understanding the Ideologies of Health and Illness'. *Australian Journal of Public Health* 16: 145-150.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage Publication.
- Mill, J. S. (1989). *On Liberty and Other Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudd, C. and Sillars, M.O. (1986). *Speech: Content and Communication (5th Ed.)* New York. Harper and Row Publishers.
- Murray, R. (2011). *Do Words Harm? The Perceptions and Attitudes of African College Students to Hate Speech*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Capella University: ProQuest LLC.
- National Cohesion and Integration Commission (2011). *Guidelines for Monitoring Hate Speech*. NCIC. Nairobi: Pamoja.
- National Cohesion and Integration Commission (2008). *National Cohesion and Integration Act*. NCIC, Nairobi: Pamoja.
- Nyewusira, V. and Nweke, K. (2012). *Party politics and democratic governance in Nigerian local government administration: The case of Rivers State (1999- 2010)*. Nigeria: River State University of Education.
- Obiakor, F.E., Smith, D. J. and Sapp, M. (2007). *Understanding the Power of Words in Multicultural Education: Multicultural Perspectives*, 2:36-42.
- Odinga, C. (2013). *Use of New Media During the Kenyan Elections: MA Thesis*. Uppsala University: Department of Information and Media.
- O'Grady, C. (2009). *Hate Speech, Media Activism and the First Amendment. Putting a Spotlight on Dehumanising Language*. New York.
- Okwengu, N. M. (2010). *The Role of Government and Media Conflict in War: A Case of the Kenyan 2007/2008 Election Violence*. A Thesis submitted in Partial fulfillment of the MSc. Development Studies. Lund University.
- Palmer, F.R. (2004). *Semantics (2nd Ed)*, U.K. Cambridge University Press.
- Pilkington, C. (1999). *The politics today companion to the British Constitution*. London:

- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J. and Levin, S. 2006. Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17:271-320.
- Riley, J. (1998). *Mills on Liberty*. London: Routledge.
- Rosenfeld, M. (2003). Hate speech in Constitutional Jurisprudence: A Comparative Analysis in, The Inaugural Conference of Floersheimer Center for Constitutional Democracy. *Fundamentals Equalities and the Challenge to Tolerance in Post – 9/11 Environment*. 24 *CARDOZO Law Review* 1523.
- Stakic, I. (2011). *Homophobia and Hate Speech in Serbian Public Discourse: How Nationalist Myths and Stereotypes Influence Prejudices Against the LGBT Minority*. M.A. thesis in Human Rights Practice. Roehampton University. U.K.
- Stibbe, A. (2001). Language, power and the social construction of animals. *Society and Animals*. 9:2:145-161.
- Uchenna, C. A. (2012). Power manifestation and manipulations in interactive discourses: Evidence from Ezikeoba elders’ council. In: *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2:10. Nigeria: University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Esoteric discourse analysis. In *Discourse and society*. 6: 5-6.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2003) “Critical Discourse Analysis”. Chapter 18 In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tennen and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Wiley-Blackwell: p. 352 - 371.
- van Dijk, T.A. 2005. Contextual knowledge management in discourse reduction: A CDA perspective. In: Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (Eds.). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*, p. 71-100. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- van Dijk, T.A.(2010). Political identities in parliamentary debates. In Llie, C. (Ed), *European Parliaments Under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices*. P. 29 – 56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Volkova, N, Silvestri, M. and Lopez, S. (2001) *Hate Speech and the Media*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Weber, A. (2009). *Manual on Hate Speech*. France: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Wekuja, I. and Greenhill, R. (2004). *Turning off the taps: Donor conditionality and water privatisation in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*. London: Action Aid International.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Company.
- Wrong, D. H. (1979). *Power. Its form, bases and use*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Yasemin, I. (2010). *The Concept of Hate Crimes, Hate Speech and Combating Hate Crimes*. Second Conference Paper Ankara- Turkey.

Appendix 1: Guiding Card

Utterance:

Elements of Hate Speech	Present/ not present
1. Speech that solicits disdain against a person/ group because of their ethnicity.	
2. Speech that encourages ethnicity.	
3. Speech that contains expressions of hatred for some group in circumstances that are likely to provoke violence.	
4. Speech that infers superiority and inferiority to parallel groups.	
5. Speech that encourages religious/ group violence.	
6. Speech that states that another person is a lesser human.	
7. Incitement to hatred against a group of persons defined in terms of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, religion and sexual orientation.	
8. Speech that states/ implies that the other person is not human e.g. calling them ‘weeds’	
9. Use of cultural stereotypes.	

10. Any form of expression regarded as offensive to racial, ethnic and religious groups.	
11. Use of inciting and or provocative language.	
12. Speech that encourages the audience into some negative violence.	
13. Speech that promotes discrimination on the basis of tribe, colour, ethnic group, religious group.	
14. Use of abusive, negative and insulting language.	
15. Speech that advocates violent acts against a specific group	
16. Use of stories that profile people and communities negatively.	
17. Use of imagery, poems, metaphor and proverbs which could stir ethnic hatred.	
18. Ridiculing of another person on basis of ethnicity, race or religious belief.	
19. Speech that creates a climate of hate or prejudice which may in turn foster the commission of hate crimes.	
20. Use of alarming language.	
21. Use of language that attacks a person/ group	
22. Speech that attacks a person's gender/ sexual orientation.	
23. Speech that inflicts emotional damage.	
24. Speech that incites a person to cause damage.	
25. Speech that causes violence to be meted against others.	
26. Distributing, showing a play or visual images that would cause ethnic hatred.	
27. Speech that arouses individuals to cause social dislocation.	
28. Providing/producing or directing a programme that would stir ethnic animosity.	
29. Utterances that contain inflammatory comments.	
30. Use of threatening, abusive words or behaviour towards a group to stir ethnic hatred.	
31. Publishing or distributing written materials that would cause ethnic hatred.	

Source: NCIA, NCIC, police training manual on the enforcement of the law on hate speech and the definitions of hate speech by Becker, Byres and Jipson (2000); Rosenfeld (2003); ICCPR (1966).