



[#hatespeech](#)

FROM HATE SPEECH TO NON-VIOLENT COMMUNICATION

УДК
ББК
О

**Ismanov, A., Kupueva, N., Stanaliev, G.,
Toktogulova, M., Turdubaeva E.**

О FROM HATE SPEECH TO NON-VIOLENT COMMUNICATION. –

Б.: 2023. – 120 p.

ISBN 978-9967-35-

The manual provides a description of various manifestations of hate speech with analysis and examples with an emphasis on the ethical aspects of using various forms of hate speech in the media space. Recommendations are given for transforming hate speech into non-violent communication based on the Rabat Plan of Action, the Camden Principles Article 19, including the recommendations of the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the UN Strategy and Action Plan for combating hate speech. For a wide range of readers.

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme, its programmes/projects or governments. The designations employed do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever concerning the legal status of any country, territory or area, or its frontiers or boundaries.

УДК
ББК

ISBN 978-9967-35-

© Ismanov A., Kupueva N., Stanaliev G.,
Toktogulova M., Turdubaeva E., 2023
© #Prevention Media, Association of
Communicators with the support of UNDP in
the Kyrgyz Republic в КР, 2023

INTRODUCTION



The manual consists of several parts on the nature of hate speech, based on the recommendations of the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; UN Strategy and Plan of Action to Combat Hate Speech, also on the papers of Article 19, Rabat Plan of Action. Including on the Camden Principles, interpreting international law and standards, recognized practices and general principles of the right to freedom of expression and equality.¹

The manual examines the ethical aspects of the use of various forms of hate speech in the media space, including in social media and instant messengers, based on the six criteria of the Rabat Action Plan² for the prohibition of propaganda of national, racial or religious hatred, which constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, contains expert opinions and recommendations. The manual provides examples of the use of hate speech, their transformation into non-violent communication, as well as recommendations for all users of social media, including media and civil society. We thank the experts who took part in the development of this manual for their fruitful work. Special thanks to UNDP

1 Camden Principles, <https://spring96.org/files/misc/camden-principles-russian-web.pdf>

2 Rabat Action Plan, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/freedom-of-expression>

in the Kyrgyz Republic for their invaluable support in the creation of this training manual. Special thanks to the Foundation “Mediaconsulting”, Politmer.kg and other experts on gender, communication and religious issues for valuable comments and recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS



Introduction	3
Hate speech	7
Classification of hate speech	12
Types of Verbal or Language Violence	17
Is hate speaking always used intentionally?	20
The difference between criticism and hate	22
Stereotypes as factors for the formation of hate speech	25
Cyberbullying or content moderation	29
Recommendations for the Rabats Action Plan	35
From hate speech to non-violent communication	44
Freedom of speech and hate speech	56
Recommendations for content producers	62
References	67

1.



HATE SPEECH



HATE SPEECH



The influence of hate speech, hatred and intolerance today has acquired impressive proportions. Its destructive impact is partly increased by the use of new information technologies. The rhetoric of enmity and hatred spread in social media and instant messengers undermines the social cohesion of citizens, breeds distrust and intolerance, sows panic, provokes people to illegal actions, creating the ground for conflict tension.

The vagueness of the legal status of hate speech is used as an infringement on freedom of expression against dissenters and opponents. At the same time, there has been little response or even ignorance of real cases of hate speech, generating violence and discrimination against vulnerable sections of society. All this causes frustration in society, so there are more and more calls to limit this or that online platform or completely close access to it. Thus, the fight against the facts of the manifestation of hate speech narrows in the direction of limiting the activities of online platforms.

In the UN Strategy and Action Plan to Combat Hate Speech, UN Secretary-General António Guterres emphasizes that *“combating hate speech does not mean limiting or prohibiting freedom of speech. It*

means preventing hate speech from escalating into something more dangerous, especially incitement to discrimination, hostility and violence, which is prohibited by international law.”³

There is no exact legal definition of hate speech, but there are definitions that are followed by international organizations with extensive experience in this sensitive area.

The UN considers *hate speech any kind of communication, verbal, written or behavioral, that is hostile or uses derogatory or discriminatory language against any person or group of people on the basis of who they are, or, in other words, on the basis of their religion, ethnic origin, nationality, race, skin color, social origin, gender and other identity factors.*⁴

In July 2021, the UN General Assembly, expressing its concern about the spread of hate speech around the world, adopted a resolution to promote interreligious and intercultural dialogue and tolerance in the context of combating hate speech, June 18 was declared the International Day against Hate Speech.⁵

The international human rights organization Article19 defines hate speech as any manifestation of discriminatory hatred towards people based on a particular aspect of their identity. Discriminatory

³ UN Hate Speech Strategy and Action Plan, 2019

⁴ UN Hate Speech Strategy and Action Plan, 2019

⁵ Promoting interreligious and intercultural dialogue and tolerance in the context of combating hate speech, <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N21/200/64/PDF/N2120064.pdf?OpenElement>

hatred is an intense and irrational feeling of enmity towards a person or group of people because of who they are, based on an identifying characteristic recognized in international human rights law.⁶

The international human rights organization Article19 defines hate speech as *any manifestation of discriminatory hatred towards people based on a particular aspect of their identity. Discriminatory hatred is an intense and irrational feeling of enmity towards a person or group of people because of who they are, based on an identifying characteristic recognized in international human rights law.*⁷

Hate speech is discriminatory communication in any format aimed at humiliation, insult, aggression on ethnic, religious, gender, gender, racial, social grounds.

Hate speech is always associated with context, which depends on the setting, the target group and the speaker, as detailed in the Rabat Action Plan.

To define hate speech, different components need to be considered, including the content of the expression, the (written or spoken) tone, the (individual and collective) goals, and the possible consequences or impact.⁸

6 Article 19, <https://challengehate.com/ru/>

7 Council of Europe, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/freedom-expression>

8 Human Rights Center, <https://humanrights.ee/ru/>

There is no clear legal definition of hate speech in the legislation of the Central Asian countries. In Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Tajikistan more often adheres to the corresponding article in the Criminal Code.

In Kyrgyzstan, n Article 330 of the Criminal Code of the Kyrgyz Republic, the emphasis is on actions aimed at *“inciting racial, ethnic, national, religious or interregional hatred (discord), humiliation of national dignity, as well as propaganda of the exclusivity, superiority or inferiority of citizens on the basis of their attitude to religion , nationality or race, committed publicly or using the media, as well as through the Internet”*.⁹

In Kazakhstan, Article 174 focuses on *“deliberate actions aimed at inciting social, national, tribal, racial, class or religious hatred”*, as well as on *“propaganda of exclusivity, superiority or inferiority of citizens”* on the grounds indicated at the beginning of the text.

In Uzbekistan, Article 156 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan emphasizes *“deliberate actions degrading national honor and dignity, insulting the feelings of citizens in connection with their religious or atheistic convictions.”* Uzbekistan is the only state in Central Asia where the Criminal Code refers to the illegality of the persecution of persons holding atheistic views.¹⁰

9 Criminal Code of Kyrgyz Republic, <http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/112309>

10 Criminal Code of Republic of Uzbekistan, <https://lex.uz/acts/111457>

In Tajikistan, Article 189 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Tajikistan focuses on *“Inciting social, racial, national, regional, religious (confessional) enmity or discord”*.¹¹

Each of us can become an object of hate speech. Publication on social media can provoke hatred and even call for murder. As happened with the Ethiopian scientist Abram Meareg. On November 3, 2021, Meareg was returning home from the university when unknown persons shot him at close range. Witnesses to the murder, fearing for their lives, did not dare to help him. The scientist’s children claim that prior to the attack, slanderous posts appeared on Facebook that revealed their father’s personal information. They complained to the moderators, but their voices were not heard. One of the posts was deleted after the murder of the professor, and the second only a year later on December 8, 2022 after the murder. The lawsuit alleges that Facebook’s algorithm contributed to the viral spread of hatred and violence. Meareg Family Demands Meta to Create a \$2 Billion Fund for Victims of Facebook Hate and Algorithm Changes on the Platform.¹²

This case is evidence that the administrators of social platforms are not able to moderate all content, social media algorithms do not always effectively block manifestations of hate speech. Especially when it comes to content in languages other than English.

11 Criminal Code of Republic of Tajikistan, <http://ncz.tj/content/уголов-ный-кодекс-республики-таджикистан>

12 Ethiopian who lost his father after being bullied on Facebook claims \$2bn from Meta, <https://cutt.ly/joIsbEN>

2.



CLASSIFICATION OF HATE SPEECH

CLASSIFICATION OF HATE SPEECH



Consider the classification of hate speech proposed by Article 19¹³ based on international documents.

In the first group: **“hate speech that should be banned”**, *this includes direct and public incitement to commit genocide; propaganda of discriminatory hatred that incites discrimination, hostility or violence; propaganda of the superiority of one race or groups of persons of a certain color or ethnic origin or justification, encouragement of racial hatred and discrimination in any form.*

The second group includes **“hate speech that may be banned”**. This can be restrictions imposed by state authorities in case of compliance with the requirements of article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. *They must have a clear legitimate aim as respect for the rights of others and are necessary in a democratic society. The Kyrgyz Republic acceded to this International Pact on the basis of Resolution No. 14,06–XII of the Jogorku Kenesh of January 12, 1994.*¹⁴

13 Article 19, https://www.article19.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/A19_Hate-Speech-Report-2018_Russian.pdf

14 Resolution of the Jogorku Kenesh of the Kyrgyz Republic, <http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/17581?cl=ru-ru>

In the third group is **“legal” hate speech**. In the definition of Article 19, it is *“statements that may be provocative and offensive, but do not meet any of the above criteria, they are characterized by prejudice and cannot serve as a basis for limiting expression.”*

Commission on Ethics of the Belarusian Association of Journalists¹⁵ proposes to consider three levels of hate speech for an even more detailed study of the causes and context of hate speech.

SOFT HATE SPEECH

1. Creation of a negative image of a certain ethnic or other group.
2. Mentioning the name of a vulnerable group in a disparaging context.
3. Statements about the inferiority of a certain group, mention in a humiliating context.
4. Quoting xenophobic statements or publishing texts of this kind without an appropriate comment that distinguishes between the opinion of the author of the statement and the journalist, allocating space in the newspaper, airtime for nationalist propaganda without editorial comment or other controversy.

¹⁵ Ethics Committee of Belarussian Association of Journalists, <https://baj.by/ru/analytics/kak-izbezhhat-yazyka-vrazhdy-v-media-sovety-kollegam-ot-komissii-po-etike-bazh>

MEDIUM HATE SPEECH

1. Justification of historical cases of discrimination and violence.
2. Publications and statements that call into question the generally accepted historical facts of violence and discrimination.
3. Allegations of historical crimes by a particular ethnic or other group.
4. Indications of the connection of a certain group with foreign political and state structures in order to discredit it.
5. Allegations about the criminality of a particular group.
6. Reasoning about the disproportionate superiority of a certain group in material well-being, representation in power structures, etc.
7. Accusations of the negative impact of any group on society, the state.
8. Appeals to prevent certain groups from gaining a foothold in a region or city.

HARSH HATE SPEECH

1. Direct and direct calls for violence, as well as calls for violent actions using common slogans.
2. Direct and immediate calls for discrimination, as well as calls for discrimination using general slogans.
3. Veiled calls for violence and discrimination (for example, propaganda of contemporary or historical experience of violence or discrimination).

Any publications or statements in which there is a contrast between “we” and “they” most often contain hate speech. They form stereotypes, provoke hatred and discriminate against people or a group of people on various grounds.

3.



**TYPES OF VERBAL OR
LANGUAGE VIOLENCE**

TYPES OF VERBAL OR LANGUAGE VIOLENCE

Violence is the deprivation of the will of a person by causing him physical and mental harm. Violence can be committed not only by beating, but also by words. In some cases, verbal abuse can be more severe and longer lasting than physical abuse.

Rudeness, pushing around, abuse. Using one of the types of hate speech, a person, belittling, scolding, shouting at the interlocutor, demonstrates his superiority. Harsh words that degrade the dignity of a person poison the soul of a person, disappoint him and make him suffer. In everyday life, most often this happens when someone is being abused.

Speaking in front of others about a person's shortcomings is also verbal abuse. In such cases, the goal is to deliberately humiliate the interlocutor in front of people, point out his shortcomings and offend. A person humiliated in public falls into depression, avoids people, isolates himself, moves away from society. Thoughts that he is “disgraced in front of people”, “what will people say now” will finally make a person indecisive, deprive him of will and faith in himself.

Treat like a child or still immature, underdeveloped person: In such cases, an attempt is made to question the adequacy of the age, professionalism, knowledge and experience of the interlocutor.

Humiliation depending on gender, race, ethnicity, social status. There are cases when a person speaks of gender, social status, ethnicity as some kind of disadvantage and uses words and expressions that humiliate them precisely on these grounds.

Use of nicknames. Apply negative nicknames to the interlocutor. This is common among teenagers.

Accusation. A person, fed with accusations and claims from another, also loses faith in himself, his will. He begins to be afraid of others and he will not be able to decide on independent actions.

Comparison. In this case, there is a comparison of people, their actions. This is used to put others above the interlocutor, to exalt their achievements, while emphasizing the shortcomings and failures of the second.

4.



**IS HATE SPEAKING
ALWAYS USED
INTENTIONALLY?**

IS HATE SPEAKING ALWAYS USED INTENTIONALLY?

No, there are cases of unintentional use of such rhetoric due to ignorance, mistake, elementary negligence or a low level of sensitivity on the subject under discussion.

Firstly, such examples occur when in a hurry we publish or distribute any information with sensitive wording, descriptions that can cause negative feelings in the audience.

Secondly, when the media use provocative, flashy headlines to grab the audience's attention.

Thirdly, the free interpretation of statistical data or the manipulation of such data to attract the attention of the audience.

Fourthly, when discussing any problematic situation, the accents are transferred to a certain ethnic or social group.

5.



THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CRITICISM AND HATE

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CRITICISM AND HATE



There is a big difference between expressing a critical opinion and blaming hate speech. It is very important to know this difference in the fight against hate speech. Criticism is a discussion, analysis of something in order to evaluate it and identify shortcomings.¹⁶

CHARACTERISTIC SIGNS OF CRITICISM

Constructiveness. Constructiveness – useful for a person whose actions are criticized. The main purpose of such criticism is to talk about the shortcomings and suggest ways to eliminate them.

Objectivity. Objective criticism reveals and shows shortcomings in life, leaving no room for argument. If a person criticizes what he does not like, such criticism is called subjective.

Justice. Criticism expressed in order to eliminate some shortcomings in the work performed is fair criticism. If a person allows himself to criticize on the basis of personal dislike, such criticism may be unfair.

¹⁶ Dictionary of Russian language, S. I. Ojegov, <https://slovarozhegova.ru/word.php?wordid=12388>

Literacy. For competent criticism you need to be a competent specialist in a certain field of activity. However, it is not necessary to be a competent specialist in order to express criticism about all the phenomena of life. For example, each person can give a critical assessment of a dish without being a cook.

An object. In general, it is not a good habit to criticize a person. It must be remembered here that criticism should not be expressed personally to a person, but to one or another shortcoming of the work done by him.

Concreteness. Criticism should be directed at specific shortcomings. Criticism expressed in general terms may not be specific.

Critical opinion, instead of the specific shortcomings of an action committed by a person, should not be directed at the person himself, and should not turn into hatred towards him. Firstly, people are very sensitive to criticism, so there is a risk of conflict. Secondly, negative information occupies their attention more than positive information and upsets them (Yzerbyt, Leyens, 1991: 339).

6.



STEREOTYPES AS FACTORS FOR THE FORMATION OF HATE SPEECH

STEREOTYPES AS FACTORS FOR THE FORMATION OF HATE SPEECH

In everyday life, public speaking, or in our comments or posts on social media, also sharing any information, there are times when we allow expressions that reflect stereotypes that have long been formed in our society: *the inhabitants of this region are like that*”, “*and those are like that*”, “*women in politics have nothing to do,*” and so on.

Let us dwell on those cases when hate speech is manifested unconsciously, that is, not on purpose, but on the basis of stereotypes. We can use hate speech with the intention of making people laugh or without any bad intentions without even noticing it.

As this example shows, it is sometimes difficult to determine how hate speech was allowed. Using it even with good intentions, for the sake of a joke, including in a non-verbal way, that is, without the help of words, for example, facial expressions or gestures, we can upset someone, offend, upset or cause him a feeling of hatred.

Hate speech arises on the basis of stereotypes.

ecause stereotypes are stable concepts. Stereotypes in people do not appear in one day, they are formed in an evolutionary way.

Online-edition Super.kg¹⁷ conducted a survey on the topic *“How do you look at the heads of families who can’t do anything?”* By publishing some of the opinions of their readers, which contain value judgments about men based on gender stereotypes. Such statements are based on a positive stereotype: “a man earns; strong; leader; independent of others”, and they do not take into account such factors as the socio-economic situation in the country, unemployment, low wages. Stereotypes, regardless of their rhetoric, hinder the analysis of the real situation, reinforcing negative characteristics.

In this regard, the use of hate speech by public and political figures is of particular importance; they increase discord in society, creating a dangerous situation when people incited by them can take illegal actions. Public and political figures should be more attentive to their rhetoric and context, show more sensitivity and understanding of all the nuances of the situation. As an example, consider the case of a verbal skirmish between deputies at a meeting of the parliamentary committee on treasury and fiscal policy. When the parliamentarians entered into a verbal conflict because of the protracted speech of one of them. The deputies exchanged remarks with each other based on gender stereotypes. This case received

¹⁷ <https://www.super.kg/kabar/news/171517>

a resonance in society, influencing the strengthening of gender stereotypes regarding women involved in political and public activities. Stereotypes contribute to discrimination of the side that is the subject of discussion. Unfortunately, negative attitudes are expressed more towards women than men.

7.



**CYBERBULLYING
OR CONTENT
MODERATION**

CYBERBULLYING OR CONTENT MODERATION



Cyber-hate, online form of hate speech and cyber-bullying are not the same thing, since the former targets certain groups based on common characteristics and the latter targets individuals, usually within a particular community setting, the two are definitely intertwined in the mind young people.

Bullying can be defined as “a type of harmful behavior that is repeated over time and occurs in the midst of interpersonal relationships characterized by power imbalances” (Olweus 1999: 25). Cyberbullying resembles bullying in that it is also deliberate, aggressive, and repetitive over time, but with the peculiarity that those who engage in it do it electronically. Some of the young people interviewed believe that posting anonymous comments online allows people to openly express intolerance, reject differences and embrace racism without the social restrictions that exist in offline communication (Assimakopoulos et.al., 2017)

Current research has shown that there is no single profile of a hater or cyberbully behind the mask of anonymity. While there are organized groups that seek to promote hate on the Internet, in most

cases the people who cover themselves with hate or discriminatory trolling posts are not affiliated with overtly intolerant ideological movements (cf. Isasi and Juanatey 2016) but are instead users who simply do not realize the potential impact of their digital activities and the consequences they can have in the offline world (cf. Stein 2016).

The hate towards certain groups that underlies hate speech, both online and offline, can also manifest itself in other forms of expression of violence and intolerance, such as (cyber)bullying. In their personal experience, some of our interviewees indicated that hate speech is closely related to the experience of (cyber)bullying, and in particular that the identity of a person is often used as a weapon by criminals to carry out (cyber)bullying. Due to its global nature, the Internet has become a space for both the expression and dissemination of intolerant ideas and beliefs (Isasi and Huanatei, 2016), offering additional means to help protect and promote discrimination, which can potentially even lead to hate crime. Such attitudes and expressions reject differences and aim to deprive individuals and groups of their dignity by denying and attacking their identity.

Mild hate speech shared online can have devastating effects on the social order, also negatively impacting those who stand for freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination in our open societies and having a

chilling effect on democratic discourse on online platforms (European Commission 2016b : 1).

The availability of online content creation today is a false illusion of anonymity and free speech (Levmore and Nussbaum, 2010). This is because Internet users can create a profile using someone else's names and images, imitating a completely new identity.

Such conditions create fertile ground for the creation and dissemination of content using hate speech, which is increasing day by day. Google and Meta, as digital monopolists, are increasingly being criticized for not doing enough to prevent their platforms from being used to attack others with hate speech, especially based on race and gender.

One of the sensitive points is the mechanisms of moderation of hate speech in social media, which do not violate the freedom of speech and expression.

For example, **the Facebook Community Standards are divided into six sections:**

(i) violence and criminal behavior;

(ii) security;

(iii) objectionable content;

(iv) integrity and authenticity;

(v) respect for intellectual property;

(vi) requests related to content. Let's take a closer look at the Facebook rules.

The Facebook Community Standards consist of three levels of prohibition of hateful content.

The first level is content directed against an individual and a group of people, which contains aggressive statements, for example, *“non-humans”, “second-class people”*;

The second is content directed against a person or a group of people on the basis of characteristics that are subject to protection from discrimination, for example, statements expressing rejection: *“I don’t respect”, “I can’t stand”, “I don’t give a damn about X”*, and so on;

The third is content that targets a person or group of people on the basis of characteristics that should be protected from discrimination and contains any of the following, such as open calls for exclusion, which involve actions such as exclusion or exclusion of certain groups (Facebook Community Standards, 2022)

On social media, people communicate, share their opinions freely when they don’t feel attacked based on their personality and interests. Some lyrics may be perceived by certain people as supporting or justifying hatred. They are called *“texts containing offensive content”* or hostile statements. Such texts can make the recipient feel excluded or offended. Hate speech can reduce comfort levels on social media, as well as provoke violence in real life (Jan Kocoń, Alicja Figas,

Marcin Gruza, Daria Puchalska, Tomasz Kajdanowicz, Przemysław Kazienko, 2021).

The definition of “hate speech” is just as difficult to understand as what might be offensive to every Internet user (Jan Kocoń, Alicja Figas, Marcin Gruza, Daria Puchalska, Tomasz Kajdanowicz, Przemysław Kazienko, 2021).

Hate speech refers to various “aggressive or degrading speech, harmful stereotypes, statements of inferiority, speech expressing contempt, disgust or rejection, swearing, and calls for exclusion or segregation” (Facebook Community Standards, 2022).

8.



**RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE RABATS
ACTION PLAN**

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE RABATS ACTION PLAN



We recommend that when analyzing manifestations of hate/hate speech, adhere to the six criteria of the Rabat Action Plan.¹⁸

1. First, **the context**. In assessing whether a particular statement likely contains a call for discrimination, hostility, or violence against the target group, context is of the utmost importance, as it can directly indicate intent and causation. When analyzing speech, it is necessary to take into account the social and political context that prevails at the time of its utterance and dissemination.

2. Secondly, **the speaker**: it is necessary to take into account the position or status of the speaker in society, in particular, the position of the person or organization in relation to the audience to which the speech is addressed.

3. Third, **intent**: Article 20 of the ICCPR provides for intent. Negligence or recklessness are not sufficient grounds for qualifying an offense under Article

¹⁸ Пороговый тест Рабатского плана действий, <https://www.ohchr.org/ru/documents/tools-and-resources/one-pager-incitement-hatred-rabat-threshold-test>

20 of the ICCPR, as this Article applies more to “propaganda” and “incitement” than to the mere dissemination or transmission of information. In this regard, the fact that there is a tripartite relationship between the object of speech, the subject of speech and the audience is important.

4. Fourth, **content and form:** the content of a speech is one of the key subjects of judicial review and is a critical element of incitement. When analyzing the content, it is necessary to take into account both the degree to which the speech was provocative and direct, as well as its form, style, the nature of the arguments of the speech or their balance.

5. Fifth, **the degree of impact of speech:** The degree of impact of speech includes such elements as its accessibility, the nature of its publicity, its importance, and the size of its audience. It is also necessary to take into account whether the speech is public, what means of distribution have been used, for example – placement in a single brochure, mainstream media or via the Internet; frequency, number and coverage of messages; whether the audience had the means to act on the incitement, whether the statement (or work) was distributed to a limited circle of people or was publicly available.

Sixth, **probability, including inevitability**¹⁹:

Incitement, by definition, refers to unfinished crimes. The acts promoted through inflammatory speech do not have to be committed for the speech to contain a crime. However, some degree of risk of harm must be present. This means that the court must establish the fact that there was a possibility that the said speech would lead to actual actions directed against the target group, taking into account that the causal relationship must be direct.

19 Пороговый тест Рабатского плана действий, <https://www.ohchr.org/ru/documents/tools-and-resources/one-pager-incitement-hatred-rabat-threshold-test>

CASE OF THE BISHKEK FEMINISTIC INITIATIVE

Consider the case against activists who spoke out against the parliamentary initiative to restrict women aged 18–20 from traveling abroad, either only accompanied by their parents, or after marriage (Roziyev, 2022). The activists organized a protest against it because the deputy’s proposal restricted the right of women to free movement and violated the Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic.

The protest, which took place near the White House, gathered about 50 participants, among whom were representatives of human rights and women’s organizations. A video of the protest was posted on the Bishkek Feminist Initiative’s TikTok profile, where users left a ton of hostile comments.

On the one hand, such a level of verbal aggression towards women is frightening and alarming, because every year the level of violence against women is growing in proportion to the hate speech on the Internet; on the other hand, there is a possibility that the users are not real, but are fakes, who also actively worked in the pre-election time on the Meta platforms (Kloop, 2020).

“Troll factories” actively promote the so-called “gender stereotypes”, the destruction of democratic institutions, and oppose free media and NGOs (Irgebaeva, 2021).

Tik-Tok’s “Community Rules” do not apply in this case, since the comments are written in the Kyrgyz

language, and automated bots do not recognize it. Therefore, in this case, it is recommended to remove and block users who spread “hate speech”, misogyny and sexism.

This case is an example of a high level of misogynistic and sexist statements, since the actors in this case are women – one of the vulnerable social groups, whose political and social activity is low precisely because of such statements addressed to them.

SPEECH CONTEXT

At the protest action, its participants chanted slogans, demanding that the authors of the initiative surrender their deputy mandate. In response, the author MP said the following: *“Thank you, thank you very much! Now my voters will come from the new buildings “Ak-Bata” and “Dordoi” If there are ten of you here, then there will be a hundred of my voters!”* His rhetoric was perceived by the participants as a direct threat. The leader of the Women’s Democratic Network, who was present at the action, shamed the deputy for such aggressive statements.

Unfortunately, in society, the level of misogyny (hatred of the female sex) and sexism (gender discrimination) remains at a fairly high level. This is confirmed by hostile statements published under the video from the protest action of activists.

Misogynistic comments and sexist statements allow themselves well-known statesmen and religious figures, politicians and media personalities, to say nothing of anonymous users of social media.

Misogyny is one of the most common forms of hate speech for which no one has ever been held accountable.

INTENTIONS

The intentions of the commentators in this case are bullying. To harass women in the political and social sphere, a set of hostile statements is used, which can be classified into the following groups: slut shaming (insulting, humiliating or punishing someone for expressing sexuality or sexual desires) (Davidyants, 2022), appeal to gender roles, shaming (shaming), devaluing the problem, and calling for violence.

Such insults and appeals can cause great harm to the psychological and physical health of the audience and lead to the subsequent removal of activists from the social and political life of society. Many activists limit their activities or generally reduce them to nothing precisely because of bullying on social media. The anonymity of the profiles of the attackers clearly indicates that mass harassment is taking place in order to discredit the women's activist community (UN, 2018).

SEVERITY OF HATE SPEECH

This video has been viewed over 200,000 times, which is a big reach for the local tik tok audience, hence the video got a lot of exposure. Unfortunately, the larger the reach of the video, the more users viewed the video and the misogynistic comments and incitement to violence.

This normalizes aggression towards politically active women and exacerbates gender inequality. The normalization of violence against women on the Internet and in the media has a direct impact on the level of violence against women. Therefore, combating misogyny is an important part of addressing domestic and gender-based violence (UNDP, 2018).

PROBABILITY OF SPEECH TO PRODUCE IMMEDIATE ACTION AGAINST THE GROUP, TO WHICH IT IS DIRECTED

Can hate speech increase the likelihood of action against activists? Yes. Depersonalization of the actors of action, their dehumanization increases the chances of violent actions against them.

Dehumanization, separation into “us and them”, “we are good, and they are bad” leads to the justification of violence against the group to which aggression

is directed, and thereby morally simplifies the performance of violent actions. The killing of women, motivated by hatred, is called “**femicide**” – the killing of a woman because she is a woman.

QUESTIONS FOR INDEPENDENT WORK:

1. *Recall similar cases. How did society react? What type of violent communication was involved? How did this affect the hero/heroine of the case?*
2. *Give examples of misogyny, sexism, social construct? How often do you encounter these concepts in real life? On social media?*
3. *Open the comments on the publications of the online edition of Kloop on Instagram or Facebook, analyze what hostile statements are found in the comments? Who are they aimed at? Who writes them? Are there any misogynistic or sexist comments among them?*

9.



**FROM HATE SPEECH
TO NON-VIOLENT
COMMUNICATION**

FROM HATE SPEECH TO NON-VIOLENT COMMUNICATION

One way to overcome hate speech and prevent its harmful impact on society is to teach non-violent communication. It is based on the principle of a joint attempt to correctly identify and meet the needs of the parties. Nonviolent communication has 4 components:

- ◆ SURVEILLANCE
- ◆ FEELINGS
- ◆ NEED
- ◆ REQUEST

Based on these components, it is possible to build non-violent communication based on mutual respect. To achieve this goal, two things are very important: firstly, the ability to listen to the interlocutor, and secondly, to perceive his feelings and needs with empathy and help to satisfy them.

THE FIRST COMPONENT OF NONVIOLENT COMMUNICATION IS OBSERVATION

When communicating, we must observe the behavior and words of the interlocutor and learn to clearly name them. In most cases, describing the action and words of a person, we begin to evaluate and criticize them. For example, when talking to parents about a student's learning problems, we say: *"He's a bad student"* or *"He's lazy."* Here we see the attitude towards the student or the critic, but we cannot get information about his problems.

So these words do not help to define and solve the problem. On the contrary, they can immediately cause a negative reaction and lead to misunderstanding or even conflicts.

When observing, feelings should also be clearly named, they should not be accompanied by an accusation of the other side. For example, your interlocutor is late, and you are upset about it. Here are two sentences describing this situation:

1. *"I'm upset that you were late"*
2. *"You're always late and upset me."*

Both of these sentences speak of the lateness of the second side and, in this regard, the upset feelings of the first. However, they evoke different reactions in the listener. Because in the first sentence, the speaker notes that the second person was late and said his

feelings.

Moreover, the fact of being late and the feelings of the speaker are conveyed directly, openly, without hiding and without causing a feeling of embarrassment. And in the second – we hear the accusation against the interlocutor that he always upsets the speaker.

The constant tardiness of the accused party is especially emphasized, respectively, the frustrated feeling of the speaker is blamed on him. As a result, after the first sentence, the speech will continue about this delay. And in the second case, it will be aimed at justification, mutual accusation of the parties, resentment, or the parties may declare an unfair accusation against them and go into mutual bickering. Therefore, it is necessary to learn to clearly identify the specific actions and words of the interlocutor, without evaluating them.

For this, the following must not be allowed:

- ♦ talking about a specific action, you can not generalize with words like: *calways you ...; You always do that; never ...; never...*

The use of such generalizing words and expressions in a conversation about one specific case will immediately cause a negative reaction and lead to a verbal skirmish and conflict between the interlocutors.

- ◆ Refrain from evaluating, labeling. Derogatory remarks: *You are a liar! You are so irresponsible!* and so on. becomes an obstacle to continued communication.
- ◆ Unsubstantiated presentation of one's own opinion as the ultimate truth. Rejection of the existence of other points of view.
- ◆ Such speech behavior prevents you from listening to the other person and continuing the conversation. For example: *ou will never change, you are who you are! It's pointless to talk to him! He doesn't deserve this job. I told you he is.*

THE SECOND COMPONENT OF NONVIOLENT COMMUNICATION IS FEELINGS.

We must learn to express our feelings. You need to be able to clearly separate feelings from opinions, evaluation and criticism.

Here is an example of expressing the same feeling in different ways:

1. *"Today, your words about the upcoming job cuts in the enterprise upset me."*
2. *"Your words about layoffs soon upset the workers."*

In the first sentence, the feeling is conveyed openly, accurately and on behalf of the speaker himself. Here he

expresses his feelings sincerely, definitely and without hiding. In the second, the same feeling is conveyed on behalf of others, and responsibility is placed on unknown persons. In this case, continuing the conversation can lead to conflict.

Feelings are directly related to our needs. When they are satisfied, we feel calm, free, satisfied, balanced, inspired, in a good mood, light and self-confident. And in case of dissatisfaction of needs, we have a feeling of insecurity, fear, anxiety, fatigue, anger, frustration. There is a feeling of lack of understanding and support of others, a feeling of humiliation.

THE SECOND COMPONENT IS NEEDS.

Needs reveal what is behind our feelings and emotions. In addition to material needs, there are known needs for trust, support, respect, understanding, independence, honesty, and achievement of goals.

By talking to others, people aim to satisfy those needs. If instead of a direct and definite expression, they are voiced indirectly and accompanied by criticism, evaluation, comparison of the actions and feelings of others, evasion of responsibility, education of others, assumption, then our conversation can go in a different direction and the arguing and argument of the talking parties begins.

This separates us from achieving our goals, because in this case, the needs that pushed us to talk remain on the sidelines and communication will go in line with excuses, mutual accusations. Especially when the conversation is emotional, we must not forget questions such as: *what are my needs? What result will I achieve from this conversation?*

In a conversation, we should pay all our attention to identifying our needs, conveying them to our interlocutor and making every effort to satisfy them as a result of communication. Negative reactions during a conversation, such as refusal to answer, aggression, silence, are all the result of unmet needs.

We should not forget that during the conversation, the needs of the interlocutor must also be satisfied. Therefore, we need to listen to his words with our heart, in other words, with empathy. Empathy is very important for communication.

THE LAST COMPONENT OF NONVIOLENT COMMUNICATION IS REQUESTS.

After expressing our feelings and needs, we must conclude our speech with specific requests, formulated not in the form of an order, intimidation, demand or obligation, but in the form of a REQUEST.

Thus, *non-violent communication is an open and sincere conversation aimed at meeting the needs of both parties and based on equality and mutual respect.*

It is very important when communicating to listen to others with empathy. It is necessary to learn to listen to the words of the interlocutor not with the mind, but with the heart. In this case, you will hear not just his words, but his emotions, see his inner state and share his feelings.

There are two types of empathy: empathy for others and empathy for oneself. The first helps to understand others, to feel their problems. And self-empathy helps you listen to yourself, identify your unmet needs.

We must develop empathy for ourselves as well. In some cases, a person can humiliate himself. For example, if someone does not accept his invitation, we may think: *“he does not like me”, “of course, who am I to him?”, “if someone else had called him, he would have rushed right away”, “it’s my own fault, And why did he ask him like that?”, “No one considers me.”*

If you’re offended, think about what need it’s talking about. Need for truth or respect or openness or support? Make it clear to the person who rejected you. Instead of blaming, belittling yourself, hating others, and looking for enemies, talk to the person who rejected you, tell him about your needs and feelings.

In an era of increasing integration of peoples, hate speech impedes the economic, social, political, and cultural development of the country. Therefore, it is necessary to think about encouraging diplomacy in relations and the ethics of dialogue in society, calling for this kind of

behavior when communicating and setting just such a direction for any socially significant speech.

Cultural intelligence or CQ is the ability of a person to understand people of a different culture and the ability to quickly get used to a multicultural environment. In other words, this ability helps us accept people who differ from us in their thinking, habits, behavior and character. It teaches to fight stereotypes and avoid hate speech.

The concept of cultural intelligence was first introduced into the scientific field by American professor Christopher Earley and professor at the Singapore Institute of Technology Sun Ang (Earley, Ang, 2003: 110-p.).

There is a four-factor model of the cultural model:

- ♦ *motivation (CQ Drive);*
- ♦ *knowledge (CQ Knowledge);*
- ♦ *metacognition (CQ Strategy);*
- ♦ *behavior (CQ Action).*

CQ Drive – is a willingness to recognize another culture and cooperate with its representatives. When people of different cultures do not want to recognize each other, enmity, mutual hatred, misunderstanding and conflicts arise.

CQ Knowledge is knowledge of the similarities and differences of another culture from ours. Here it is wrong to see only differences or, conversely, only similarities. It is important to know and accept both sides correctly.

CQ Strategy is to have relevant information while establishing links with other cultures, ie. know their culture and conduct work by planning cooperation in advance.

CQ-Action is a person's ability to adapt their verbal and non-verbal behavior to different cultures. For example, when talking with a representative of another culture, watch your words, tone of voice, facial expressions and gestures.

When communicating between representatives of two different cultures, the smallest things immediately catch your eye, and can hurt the interlocutor. Therefore, in intercultural communication, the observance of the ethics of dialogue is of great importance.

Cultural intelligence in the modern world is a necessary skill for people who can resist hate speech, discrimination and xenophobia. Therefore, the development and dissemination of this skill is very important for every state, every society and for every person.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-DISCUSSION:

1. Is it difficult for you to live and work abroad with representatives of another culture? If you find it difficult to find a common language with them, and you find yourself in a stressful situation, what will you do to get out of it:
 - ♦ Will you think over your words and speak prudently?
 - ♦ Will you control your facial expressions and gestures?
 - ♦ Can you see your stereotypes about them?
2. If conflicts arise with representatives of other cultures, what will you do to resolve them?
3. What do you focus on when creating relationships with people you don't like: differences or similarities?
4. Let's imagine that someone on social media wrote a comment using aggressive rhetoric that hurts your national pride. It does not contain calls to "kick you out", "go and beat you", but there is humiliation based on a stereotype about your ethnic group. What will be your reaction?
 - ♦ Do you think it is right to answer the author of the comment in his style, with rude and offensive words?
 - ♦ Do you contact the relevant authorities with a claim for insult honor?

- ♦ Try to click on «complain» and force to delete a comment?
- ♦ Do not pay attention and leave unanswered?
- ♦ Do you have another answer?

10.



FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND HATE SPEECH

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND HATE SPEECH

In liberal societies, free speech is one of the contentious issues and it is often difficult for many people to distinguish between hate speech and free speech. And many of those who think that hate speech is freedom of expression and only a forward-looking issue do not think that hate speech reduces tolerance.

Offensive language on various social media platforms causes violence in the real world.

Recently, hate speech has taken on a prominent role in media and communications research (Chetty & Alathur, 2018). This interest stems in part from concerns about the ability of ICTs to propagate intolerant discourses by enabling borderless, relatively inexpensive, and ubiquitous communication for the immediate exchange of information and opinions (Schieb & Preuss, 2016).

The question that needs to be answered is what steps should be taken to contain the threat of hate speech when “free speech” is used as an excuse and applicants are looking for concrete evidence to establish that the exercise of free speech caused tangible harm.

If clear guidelines are formulated, there will be a clear distinction between freedom of speech and hate speech. Freedom of speech is a fundamental value and should be protected.

It is clear that the nature of threats and attacks faced by journalists and the impact of these threats and attacks are often related to gender and other factors such as race, ethnicity, religion or belief, sexual orientation, age and social group (OSCE, 2020).

Hate speech is not welcome. . . [because] it views members of the target group as an internal enemy, refuses to accept them as legitimate and equal members of society, lowers their social status, and undermines the very basis of citizenship in one way or another.

It creates barriers of mistrust and hostility between individuals and groups, sows fear, prevents normal relations between them, and in general, has a corrosive effect on the course of collective life.

Hate speech also offends the dignity of members of the target group by stigmatizing them, denying their ability to live as responsible members of society, and ignoring their individuality and differences, reducing them to homogeneous members of the respective racial, ethnic or religious group. (Parekh, 2017).

Parekh considers the arguments against the legislative prohibition of hate speech and

considers six of the most common, although none of them seems convincing to him. Summing up his presentation of these arguments, they are as follows:

- ♦ **firstly**, *freedom of speech is a very important value and that tolerance for the harm caused by hate speech is a small price to pay in the interest of freedom of speech;*
- ♦ **secondly**, *that evil ideas are best defeated by critical analysis and opposition to them, or, as Americans often say, by a lot of words;*
- ♦ **thirdly**, *the ban on hate speech will open the floodgates for all kinds of restrictions on speech;*
- ♦ **fourthly**, *the state should not judge the content of the speech, but should maintain moral neutrality;*
- ♦ **fifthly**, *citizens are responsible and independent individuals who can independently evaluate speech without the prohibitions imposed by the paternalistic state;*
- ♦ **and finally**, *this law cannot change attitudes and eliminate hatred. (Parekh, 2017).*

While all of these objections to hate speech laws are familiar to those who have been involved in debates on such matters, they do not include an argument that is especially important to those who have been practitioners of the defense of free speech.

The point is that hate speech laws necessarily give governments considerable discretion, and that discretion is often abused.

Speech bans are usually vague in nature. They seek to ban harms such as defamation, obscenity, sedition, violations of national security, violations of privacy, and incitement to hatred or enmity. What they can't do, of course, is specify which words are forbidden.

This is because those who express themselves can do so in many ways. They can convey messages directly or indirectly, overtly or implicitly, and through a variety of rhetorical devices. For anyone who intends to offend or stigmatize someone for racial or religious reasons, it is very easy to come up with a new insult that achieves this goal.

Therefore, law enforcement must inevitably be given a free hand against those who incite hatred if they seek to punish or discourage such practices.

Such caution is required due to the need to interpret the meaning and intent of words that are not expressly prohibited by law. As should be obvious, the authorities involved in such interpretations usually represent and reflect the interests and prejudices of the dominant segment of the population in any society.

Accordingly, it is not surprising that, in practice, hate speech laws, themselves to discretionary enforcement, can be used to silence disadvantaged segments of the

population. The very minorities that are often targeted by hate speech and who are allegedly protected by laws against hate speech can be disproportionately prosecuted for violating the laws.

11.



RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTENT PRODUCERS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTENT PRODUCERS



Journalists are often accused of using “hate speech”, but in most cases, the media is only guilty of conveying other people’s offensive words. It is important to understand that an outrageous statement is not news.²⁰

The journalist is obliged to study the context in which the phrase was uttered, as well as the status and reputation of the speaker. You should not publish the statements of a politician–instigator who has a history of manipulating the audience. If ordinary people show aggression, it is better to ignore it.

When dealing with a story that uses hate speech, it’s important not to sensationalize it.

- ◆ The story itself may be outrageous, but is it worth publishing? What are the speaker’s intentions?
- ◆ What will be the impact of the publication?

²⁰ Ethical journalism, <https://ethicaljournalismnetwork.org>

- ♦ Is there any danger of igniting passions, inciting violence?
- ♦ Is the statement based on facts and are the statements correct?

When collecting and editing controversial material, a journalist must avoid haste. It is helpful to pause, even briefly, to consider the content of the message.

- ♦ Did you manage to avoid clichés and stereotypes?
- ♦ Have all important and necessary questions been asked?
- ♦ Do we have a good feel for the audience?
- ♦ Is the language of publication moderate enough?
- ♦ Do the photos show history without resorting to violence?
- ♦ Use different sources of information and include the voices of significant minorities?
- ♦ Does the publication meet the standards of an editorial and ethical code?

Before sending the material, it is always a good idea to review it again and think.

- ◆ Is the job done really well?
- ◆ Do you have any doubts?
- ◆ Maybe consult with a colleague?

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOCIAL MEDIA

1. Hostile statements on social media can be influenced in the following ways: send a complaint to the administration of Facebook or the page; put an “outrageous” emoji, thereby showing the inappropriateness of hostile statements in the comments; you can also write a comment in support of a person experiencing pressure on social networks and experiencing cyberbullying.
2. If you experience cyberbullying on the Internet: first, try to limit or even stop using social media and the Internet for a while. Tell someone who can support you during this difficult time. Remember that cyber threats are criminally punishable and you can write a statement to the police in case of blackmail and threats; You must have screenshots of comments or messages with you.

The background features a dark blue vertical bar on the left, a white area on the top right, and a large blue area at the bottom. Two teal rectangular bars are positioned diagonally, one above and one below the main text area. A thin white vertical line is located to the right of the text.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

INTERNATIONAL PACTS:

- ♦ UN Strategy and Action Plan to Combat Hate Speech, 2019,
- ♦ Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, 2019,
- ♦ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/conventions/pactpol.shtml
- ♦ European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, <https://www.coe.int/ru/web/compass/the-european-convention-on-human-rights-and-its-protocols>

NATIONAL LEGISLATION:

- Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic, <http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/112213?cl=ru-ru>
- Ratification of the ICCPR by the Kyrgyz Republic, <http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/17581?cl=ru-ru>
- Criminal Code of the Kyrgyz Republic, <http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/112309>

REFERENCES:

- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures.
- Vincent Y. Yzerbyt and Jacques-Philippe Leyens Requesting Information to Form an Impression: The influence of Valence and Confirmatory Status *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 27, 337-356 (1991)
- Александровский Ю.А. Социальные катаклизмы и психическое здоровье. – Наука и жизнь. 2008. № 1.
- Борев Ю.Б. Мир не умрет, если будет умирать от смеха // Курьер ЮНЕСКО. – 1976. – Май.

- ♦ Верховский, А.М. Язык мой... Проблема этнической и религиозной нетерпимости в российских СМИ /А.М. Верховский. — М.: РОО «Центр «Панорама», 2002.
- ♦ Воронина Е.А., Токтогулова Э., Эржан Кайыпов. «Язык вражды» в современном медиа- и коммуникационном пространстве: Учебно-методическое пособие для преподавателей вузов. — Бишкек: ОФ «Центр поддержки СМИ», 2021. — 136 с.
- ♦ Григорян А.А., Григорян А.Ю. Объективация женщины как один из видов сексизма. — Вестник Ивановского государственного университета. Серия: Гуманитарные науки, 2021.
- ♦ Евстафьева А. В. «Язык вражды» в средствах массовой информации: лингвистические и экстралингвистические факторы функционирования. //Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. — Тамбов, 2009
- ♦ Ильин Е. П. Психология общения и межличностных отношений. — СПб.: Питер, 2009. — 576 с.
- ♦ Кадырбекова Н. Тоголок Молдонун поэзиясынын өзгөчөлүгү. Известия Вузов, № 4, 2011

- ♦ Семечкин Н.И. Психология малых групп. Владивосток, 2005.
- ♦ Султанова Ж. В. Этноцентризм в современном мире: истоки, сущность, практики. – Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата социологических наук. – Казань, 2005
- ♦ Тард Г. Общественное мнение и толпа. Москва, Институт психологии РАН, изд. КСП+, 1999.
- ♦ Язык вражды в пред- и поствыборном дискурсе КР, финальный отчет, август-декабрь, 2021 года. 38, 40-б. /Школа миротворчества и медиатехнологий в ЦА.
- ♦ Миронова, М. В. (2019). Становление термина «Языковая дискриминация» в современной социалингвистике. *New Language. New World. New Thinking*, 555.
- ♦ Себрюк, А. Н. (2019). Лингвистическая дискриминация и лингвистическая апроприация как примеры феномена двойственного сознания в США. *Вестник Новосибирского государственного университета. Серия: Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация*, 17(1), 134-148.
- ♦ Blanchet Philippe, *Discriminatio: combattre la glottophobie*, p. 44, 2016, Ed. Textuel, 2016, 191 p.

- ♦ Estep, K. (2017). Constructing a language problem: Status-based power devaluation and the threat of immigrant inclusion. *Sociological Perspectives*, 60(3), 437-458.
- ♦ Hill, J. (2007). Mock Spanish: A site for the indexical reproduction of racism in American English. *Race, ethnicity, and gender: Selected readings*, 270-284.
- ♦ Hill, J. H. (2009). *The everyday language of white racism*. John Wiley & Sons.
- ♦ Hill, J. H. (2014). Mock Spanish, covert racism, and the (leaky) boundary between public and private spheres. In *Languages and publics* (pp. 83-102). Routledge.
- ♦ Hill, J. H. (2014). The racializing function of language panics. In *Language ideologies* (pp. 245-267). Routledge
- ♦ Ronkin, M., & Karn, H. E. (1999). Mock Ebonics: Linguistic racism in parodies of Ebonics on the Internet. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 3(3), 360-380.
- ♦ Meek, B. A. (2006). And the Injun goes "How!": Representations of American Indian English in white public space. *Language in Society*, 35(1), 93-128.
- ♦ Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, and Phillipson, Robert, «'Mother Tongue': The Theoretical and Sociopolitical Construction of a

Concept.» In Ammon, Ulrich (ed.) (1989). Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

- ♦ Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (1998)., Linguicide. In Mey, Jacob L. (ed.). Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press, for Elsevier Science (an updated version of the same entry in Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Elsevier).
- ♦ Tomic, P. (2013). The colour of language: Accent, devaluation and resistance in Latin American immigrant lives in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 45(1), 1-21.
- ♦ Акматалиев, Амантур Сейтаалы уулу (2002). Каада-салт, үрп-адат, адамдык оң-терс сапат. – Бишкек: Бийиктик.
- ♦ Ismailbekova, A., & Megoran, N. (2020). Peace in the Family is the Basis of Peace in the Country: How Women Contribute to Local Peace in Southern Kyrgyzstan. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 14(4), 483-500.
- ♦ Ismailbekova, A. (2016). Constructing the authority of women through custom: Bulak village, Kyrgyzstan. *Nationalities papers*, 44(2), 266-280.

- ♦ Карыпкулов, А. түз. (1995). Манас энциклопедиясы, I. Бишкек: Мурас
- ♦ Карыпкулов, А. түз. (1995). Манас энциклопедиясы, II. Бишкек: Мурас
- ♦ Манас: Саякбай Карала уулунун варианты боюнча. Манас үчилтигинин 2-китеби, Фрунзе. 1986. Кыргызстан басмасы. С Мусаев жана М.Мукасов
- ♦ kmb3.kloop.kg/index.php/2010/04/13/manas-eposu-internette-2/ Саякбайдын варианты
- ♦ Sadyrbek, M. (2017). Legal pluralism in Central Asia: local jurisdiction and customary practices. Routledge
- ♦ Тегизбекова, Ж. Обычное право кыргызов: Брак и семья. Бишкек, 2016.
- ♦ Bowers, Richard; Moffett, 2 (2012). Empathy in Conflict Intervention: The Key to Successful NVC Mediation. Harmony World Publishing.
- ♦ Kashtan, M. (2012) «Nonviolent Communication: Gandhian Principles for Everyday Living», Satyagraha Foundation for Nonviolence Studies, April 2012.
- ♦ Kashtan, Inbal (2004). Parenting From Your Heart: Sharing the Gifts of Compassion, Connection, and Choice. Puddledancer Press.

- ◆ Rosenberg, Marshall (2003). *Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life*. Puddledancer Press.
- ◆ Rosenberg, Marshall B. (2004). *Raising Children Compassionately: Parenting the Nonviolent Communication Way*. Puddledancer Press.

For all questions, please contact by e-mail:
preventionmediaca@gmail.com

ВЫХОДНЫЕ ДАННЫЕ