



*The role of philosophical discourse as a horizon for
coexistence in hate speech*

Benchikh Asma

Djelfa University, (algeria)

Asma.benchikh@univ-djelfa.dz

Abstract

This study deals with the topic of hate speech as a social phenomenon known to the human public sphere in today's world, where different political, religious, cultural, ethnic and media sources stand behind this discourse, and it has become a clear existential anxiety for the contemporary man. On this basis the philosophical discours comes in our appreciation as an alternative vision that seeks to provide solutions and mechanisms. It is possible to dry up the sources of this discourse, whatever its justifications. Therefore, this study come to present a philosophical approach, considering philosophy carries a horizon towards to hate and coexistence that the modern man dreams of.

Article info

Received 29 July 2023
Accepted 30 August 2023

Keyword:

- ✓ Hate Speech
- ✓ Philosophical Discourse
- ✓ Public Space:
- ✓ The Hatred

1. Introduction

Hate speech has become one of the popular concepts and pragmatics in various research and studies spaces, considering hatred and calling for violence through these discourses have become an ontological obsession for modern man. the source of this speech has multiplied and its political, cultural, cognitive, religious and mathematical forms have diversified, and this is what makes us live a real concern for our security and stability, which is supposed to be based on peace, love, coexistence, rapprochement and acculturation, and on this basis, hate speech is a phenomenon that needs deep and careful reading by different disciplines and fields of knowledge similar to sociology, anthropology, psychology, political science and law. Perhaps the philosophical discourse is one of the cognitive pests capable of providing an approach to this phenomenon on the premise that philosophy at its core believes in difference, coexistence, tolerance and acceptance of the other who are intellectually, linguistically, ethnically, religiously and culturally different, and this is what we touch in various philosophical models ancient, modern and contemporary, and in order to submit this reading under the title of this research paper – the role of philosophical discourse as a horizon for coexistence in the shadow of hate speech – We hope to achieve a number of goals, the

most important of which is to identify the concept of hate speech, its nature, forms and backgrounds, as well as to provide an alternative philosophical discourse that would absorb the backgrounds of this phenomenon and provide available alternatives in order to build a human society that believes in the language of tolerance and coexistence and denounces various forms of hatred and violence in all its forms.

2. Analytical approach:

2.1 Philosophical discourse and hate speech have no relationship:

The person who is concerned with the issue of hate speech in relation to philosophical discourse finds himself facing a number of major questions and problems on the basis that hate speech has its own premises, destinies and backgrounds, and philosophical discourse also has its premises, goals and objectives, but what unites the two parties is the moment of collision in which hate speech appears in various political, cultural, media, religious and ethnic forms...That is, it highlights its hatred and hatred towards the other that is different in religion, religion, race, color and other differences, then the philosophical discourse appears as a speech aimed at tolerance, difference, acceptance of the other and coexistence with him Whatever his ontological image and his realistic presence, i.e. looking at

him as a human being who shares with others the moments of existence, and while we talk about hate speech as carrying one color, hatred and non-acceptance of the other, if we turn towards philosophical discourse, we do not find it a single color and a vision that is all heading towards tolerance, empathy and respect for the different other, but on the contrary, we find philosophical discourse in some of its images and historical moments a hostile and violent speech encouraging violence and intolerance, as the French philosopher explains "Jean-Paul Sartre" the basic relationship between modern selves is a relationship of conflict on an existential level, the self in its essence and content is a desire and this desire always collides By the desire of the other, where he says what is stated: "The desire for one thing becomes a desire for the other, a desire to extract the recognition of the other. the struggle between selves on an existential level is a deadly struggle to prove the authenticity of the self and the recognition of the other." (Sartre, 1998, p. 127) this perception, presented to us by the French existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre, applies to individuals and groups in their various political, religious and cultural forms...Even the ideologies present in the world today are based on this violent tendency as a desire to extract recognition from those who disagree with it, and not far from the Sartre analysis of the phenomenon of violence and hatred as an essence in the self, Sigmund

Freud argues that there is a space within Man has not reached the rational enlightenment understanding preached by Enlightenment philosophers, rationalists and Missionaries of the concept of rational man, and this space is the source of all forms of violence, destruction and hatred, Freud wondered whether man in his Relationship with others is a lover of goodness, tolerance, recognition and coexistence, or is he driven to aggression, injustice, bullying and hatred of others Under the headline of Freud's book "anxiety in civilization", the man recorded his pessimistic analytical vision about man and his destiny to exist as a being driven from within by colliding piles of the unconscious, where he is led by blind instincts that repudiate all values and principles. Freud's man is not as some people imagine on the basis that he is a kind, tolerant being He loves others and wishes them security and peace, this beautiful image of man is nothing but a misplaced portmanteau, and it is an expression that carries hypocrisy inside him, because the truth of man is otherwise, man, as Freud portrayed him, is a being who carries hatred, violence, and a reservoir of forms of revenge and aggression, and his justification for this is that every "man is inclined to exploit, Excel, and abuse the other to satisfy his organic and psychological needs, man is organically driven to satisfy his needs from aggression, as he is driven to follow his

need from Sex" (Freud, 1989, p. 110) this is how Freud's opinion settles on that violence, hatred and revenge are not so much historical qualities as they are intrinsic qualities that exist in human selves, that is, they have depth in every human self and have nothing to do In fact, as some people imagine, especially the Marxists, who linked violence and conflict with the social situation, which as soon as it rises to something better, this aggression and conflict disappears in Man and man becomes tolerant and sympathetic to others, and this is what Freud rejects at all, because violence has an essence in the self. "Violence as sex is the most essential feature of man before it was a major feature in history." (Freud, 1989, p. 133) the fact is that the Freudian presentation of the phenomenon of violence as inherent in subjectivity was confirmed by Hobbes in his writings when he showed that the sources of violence exist in human nature and are based on three Origins: rivalry, caution, pride. The life of humans from beginning to end is rooted in these instincts, where competition between them drives them to revenge and generates hatred for them and caution becomes a way of life, and all this is for the sake of preserving pride and the status that humans should have, therefore Hughes declares that man is a wolf for his brother Man." (Thomas, 2011, p. 82) the fact is that this description given by Hobbes about man does not stop at the limits of the

natural stage, but it is an absolute description befitting even the civilized and civil stage, and this confirms that evil, injustice and hostility are inherent qualities in self, according to Hobbes, the world of man is a world of wolves, human life you care about wolves, and everyone is lurking around for the sake of possession and control, and this is the purpose of existence, as if War is the destiny of human beings, as Heraclitus portrayed it to us when he considered violence necessary for the world, reducing it to his famous saying: "war is the father of Everything" (Fattah & Hobes Thomas, 1985, p. 210). These brief readings that we have consulted within this paper suggest to us that the philosophical vision in some aspects bears a gloomy form and a pessimistic color in its view and reading of the phenomenon of violence and hate speech as two sides of the same coin, namely the rejection of the other and not recognizing him as a partner in existence requires dealing with it in the language of recognition and tolerance, but this gloomy picture and dramatic analysis soon it is based on the fact that philosophy, since ancient times, has come to elevate man and bring him out of the state of moral poverty and animalistic tendency to Philosophy as major texts, codes and formats has placed us in a privileged position in many of its models to express the contents of the high philosophical discourse that directs man towards virtue, goodness and noble human

values, away from the necessity based on discrimination and difference in the name of religion, language, race, culture, history or identity...Enlightenment philosophical texts have been present both in the space of Western culture from Greece to today and in the framework of Arab-Islamic culture as texts that carry anti-discourses such as various forms of hatred, and on this basis we try to recall These texts are included in this study in order to understand their contents and how they formed a horizon of coexistence and difference instead of the frustrating vision and nihilistic reading that makes a person disgusted with his past and afraid of his present and sees in his future only ruin and destruction, as depicted by some philosophical readings that judged a person to be haunted by hatred, aggression and violence.

2 / mechanisms of philosophical discourse in the face of hate speech:

There is no difference in recognizing that hate speech has become an intractable human phenomenon given the intersection of this speech with different colors intertwined with it, such as freedom of opinion, freedom of expression and self-freedom...Moreover, hate speech is driven by ideological, political, cultural and ethnic backgrounds that feed and support it under various names. Therefore, this speech has become a reality of concern because it carries a destructive project for the real existence, which is supposed to be

based on security, peace and stability, and hate speech to this day is still an ambiguous and vague concept and we can hardly find a clear definition for it, as all the definitions provided about it reflect a certain view and background behind this or that definition, but it can be said that hate speech in general is "a speech that includes an attack, incitement, disparagement or disparagement of a person or a group of people because one, some or all of them have a distinctive human characteristic such as race, religion or gender (...) This speech is usually used or developed to root and spread a call to hatred and discrimination against According to this approach, hate speech becomes a tool to stimulate feelings (centre, 2019, p. 06), provoke them and mobilize them negatively in a certain direction, becoming an incitement and a call to despise the different in religion, language, culture, affiliation, identity and other forms of differentiation. the concept of hate speech is stated in the document of the United Nations as an organization seeking peace and security in the whole world: "A type of oral, written or behavioral communication that attacks or uses derogatory or discriminatory language by referring to a person or group on the basis of identity, in other words on the basis of religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, color, origin, gender or one of the other factors determining identity" (Guterres, 2019, p. 02) the UN regulations in this regard have

shown that hate speech usually derives its existence from feelings of intolerance, racism and other predisposing backgrounds. Despite the danger of this phenomenon to the lives of peoples and societies, until today the concept of hate speech is still an ambiguous and loose concept, even within official bodies, and the Prohibition of hate speech has not been explicitly addressed in most international charters, as there have been questions raised as to when this speech is classified as hate speech Or within the freedom of expression And where exactly is it placed When will the author of this letter, whether an individual or a group, become subject to punishment and legal accountability Therefore, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on hate speech tried to define it by saying that: "All forms of expression that propagate, incite, encourage or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance" (nation, 2003, p. 06) despite the preparation of many charters and the control of many international conventions, hate speech is still a mercurial concept attracted by many convictions and perceptions related to racism, superiority and cultural centrality, which many sing in the framework of the cultural disparity between the North and the South. Therefore, it can be said in general that hate speech is, in the end, an attitude and opinion held by a person or carried by a group, institution, party,

political or religious party towards another different one, and this is what makes the world live in a state of fear, insecurity and instability, so how is the way to overcome this complex situation in the name of alternative discourse, which philosophy carries as a human horizon.

Philosophy in its essence is based on diversity and multiplicity and does not believe in the logic of one single opinion, the continuation of philosophy in history depends on the diversity and multiplicity and listening to the other under penalty of opinion and opposing opinion, and this is what the major philosophical texts and its neighbor philosophical systems of various names carried, although it is necessary to admit that there are some readings presented a harsh and gloomy picture of the role of philosophy in light of violence and hatred, and this is what we have dealt with from the beginning, but this picture hardly appears in front of the major texts, which were founded on central concepts such as tolerance, coexistence, closeness, love and brotherhood among all, no matter the contradictions that they carry in their cultural identities or And because this research paper cannot accommodate the huge number of these tolerant and rejecting readings of the logic of violence and hatred, we will try to identify some of the models that we see have formed an intensive presence in this direction, whether in the field of Western culture or within the framework of Arab-Islamic

culture. the aim behind this cognitive investigation is an attempt to provide philosophical approaches that can be invested at the moment in order to overcome many conflicts and congestion that often float to the surface of human reality, examples of this are many and numerous. The ethnic conflict, the conflict of skin and identity in the United States of America is a conflict based on hatred, the conflict of minorities in some Arab countries is a conflict of hatred, the conflict of immigrants in European countries is a conflict of hatred, hate speech towards Muslims and Islam in the name of what is known as Islamophobia is a conflict of hatred, and the Arab and Muslim an alternative that refines it and makes it a speech of peace and security And love.

Perhaps one of the slogans that has become an urgent necessity in our time, given the alarming spread of various forms of extremism and hatred among peoples, nations, civilizations and even within single societies is the slogan of tolerance and coexistence. if we say tolerance, we mean the philosophical field or the role that philosophy can play in this context, considering tolerance as a central concept within the philosophy of values and the philosophy of ethics. great philosophers have bet on this concept in order to be a means of reducing feelings of hatred and calling for it. "the history of philosophy shows us that tolerance has always been a fundamental component of philosophy."

(al-Jabri, 2007, p. 21). The philosopher of Cordoba Ibn Rushd defended the sciences of others, that is, their opinions and beliefs on the issues of the universe, nature, man and other issues, and called for the need to take them and consider their contents and benefit from them, and even went further when he sought excuses for the owners of them if they made mistakes in the readings and explanations they provided: "Whether it was the one who did not participate in the Millah or the one who did not participate." this is Ibn Rushd's response to the speakers and jurists who were rejecting the early Sciences of development to the cumulative historical character of human knowledge, Ibn Rushd says the following: "if we write to those of us who advanced from the previous nations, considering the assets and considering them as required by the evidence tapes, we should look at what they said of that and what they proved in their books, what was in agreement with the truth, we accepted it from them, pleased with it, thanked them for it, and what was not in agreement with the truth we warned him, warned him, and excused them for him". If we follow the texts of Ibn Rushd in the same context, we find tolerance reaching its extent and reaching its peak in his attitude to the opinions of dissenters and opponents when we find him blaming Imam Abu Hamid Al-Ghazali on the basis that he did not understand and did not accept the position of opponents, but ruled his corruption without considering the

premises that led to him, and in this Ibn Rushd says what the text says, "it is fair to make their argument in this and on their behalf, as they have to invoke it." the meaning in this witness are the owners of the difference, especially the MU'tazila, as well as philosophers in order to build a philosophical vision whose approach is based on tolerance, the philosopher of Cordoba returns to asking the opinion of the first teacher in the field of Mental need And accept it where he says: "It is just, as the wise Aristotle says, that a man comes from arguments to his opponents as much as he comes to himself (...) Anyone who chooses to seek the truth if he finds an outrageous statement and does not find any laudable prefaces that remove that heinousness from him should not think that that statement is invalid and ask for it from the way the plaintiff claimed to stop him from it and use it to learn from the length of time and the order that the nature of that learned matter requires" this is how we find tolerance in the philosophy of Ibn Rushd, who rises to the rank of justice when it comes to the need to recognize the different other intellectually, even if he is wrong, wisdom requires not to despise him, scold him, or pass a harsh judgment towards him, and this is in our estimation, a very refined philosophical speech we do not find Similar to it in ancient and contemporary philosophical discourses. Ibn Rushd provides us with a philosophical discourse based on the logic of recognition and

acceptance of the other and identification with his perceptions, which if justified and proven, we based on it, and if it carries something else, we left it without offending the owners, and this is the critical role of philosophy, as it tends towards criticizing ideas and perceptions and not to mug and slander defender of tolerance and the need to recognize religious, ethnic, linguistic and identity differences...The line is strongly present in the writings of The German philosopher Immanuel Kant believes that hatred and religious intolerance is the cause of the evils and sectarian wars that tore Germany and various European countries, which were between two main doctrines, Catholic and Protestant, and this is what cost Europe at that time millions of victims from both sides, Kant demanded through his texts the need to abandon the classical and dark concept of religion and adopt a new A History in which reason triumphs over desires and whims and in which man respects his brother man, regardless of his position of faith or Ethnic or cultural...It should be noted that Kant is considered one of the pioneers of German idealistic thought, given the volume of ideas that he advocated in their transcendental form, which aimed to build a new concept of man, a moral man who rejects violence, murder, cursing and exposure to others by intrigue and aggression, but he must be a refined human being who addresses people in their humanity, where his treatment of others

becomes at the level at which he deals with himself or, as Kant says in one of his moral rules, "act as if the Muslim of your action had to rise by your will to a general Natural Law" and this moral rule Kant considered it a fundamental principle of all other rules that should be sanctified This is highlighted by the ethical rule in which Kant says: "do the action so that humanity in your person and in the person of everyone else is treated as always and at the same time an end in itself and never treat it as if it were just a means".

These Kantian moral rules elevate human behavior to the ranks of humanity, as they do not address a specific race or a nation in itself, as much as they are a universal human speech that is valid for all human beings, and this is what makes the Kantian speech a foundational speech for the concept of tolerance and rejection of hatred and violence in all its various forms. Within the framework of German philosophy, it is always impossible to talk about rapprochement, communication and acculturation with others without returning to the philosopher of communication, Jurgen Habermas, the latter, who gave the public space his right of philosophical analysis and demanded the need to combat all forms of conflict and moral chaos occurring between people as a means of fueling strife and racial, religious and ethnic conflicts it is fueled by deviant and violent ideas in the name of freedom of opinion and freedom of expression, but in

the end it reflects a state of Racism and abhorrent arrogance that dates us back to before civilization and civilization, so Habermas's philosophical act focuses on the idea of public space-Espace publique- As a central concept accompanying his communicative philosophy, Habermas paid attention to it within his various works, speaking about the role that philosophy can play in the framework of public space. philosophy, in his view, has played a historical role since the Greeks, as it contributed to building Greek civil society and elevating it from the state of conflict and chaos to the state of wisdom and dialogue, that is, it elevated him from the state of and intertwined to a great degree of complexity where ideas devoted to violence and murder spread The world today is no longer innocent and harmonious as much as it is a big arena for the struggle of opposites and interests, the conflict of ideas, civilizations, religions and other images that indicate that there is a war of hatred that surfaced sometimes in the name of politics, sometimes in the name of religion, and sometimes in the name of sports, and thus hate speech tries to recognition of the difficult role that philosophy has today, as it must contribute to In this context, he called for the need to establish a democratic, universal public space governed by the ethics of dialogue and debate, because disrupting communication and dialogue is one of the main factors leading to violence and

hatred, and philosophy should look for a high-class model in human communication in which everyone becomes equal, because democracy eliminates all incentives and barriers ethnic, linguistic and religious and establishes the concept of fair and tolerant human rapprochement with others, "horizontal communication is the only way to overcome the situation of violence and conflict, because the goal of philosophy is to reconstruct the conditions for achieving the task of philosophy, according to the hyperbolic proposition, is to clean up the cycle of violence." Public space from all illusions and destructive ideas that encourage conflict and violence under any pretext and work to open the human mind to free ideas on the basis that no one has the right to be the owner of truth and truth and that everyone stands on one level in this existence. The right to differ and demand diversity is a human project that philosophy endures today and must achieve its goals, one of the noble goals of which is human dignity.

The communicative philosophical ambition of Habermas largely intersects with the moral outlook that we have seen in the Kantian proposition earlier, Habermas carries a desire and philosophical ambition that seeks to achieve the act of communicating with others and dealing with the different and the heterogeneous as an end in itself without exploiting it or trying to use it for narrow utilitarian and expedient purposes, and thus attacks the

reformist and pragmatic philosophies to create a moral universe that takes into account all human beings and treats them in their highest humanity and dignity, regardless of their historical or civilized status, or Social and cultural, because the lesson of man is not at the level that he possesses, and the saying of moral universalism has it as the guarantor of the rapprochement of human beings and bridging human relations between them because it believes in equality between all and eliminates all forms of illegal and unjustified inequality, Habermas says the following: "The desire to achieve the act of communicating with others makes it possible to treat the other as an end in itself and to move away from exploiting it as either a means or a tool to pass on Purposes and thus be able to create a moral universe." this is how Habermas presents his conception of the function of philosophy within the framework of the theory of communicative action, a conception that tries to highlight the importance that philosophy enjoys in the public space, in which dark ideas based on hatred, hatred, hatred, racism and abhorrent chauvinism have ethically, philosophy can be performed as a horizon of coexistence, acculturation and a spacious space for the recognition of the different within the space In the same context, he also brings with us the contemporary philosophical discourse through the reading defended by the French philosopher Edgar Moran, who considered

hate speech a form of barbarism that we must fight with all available civilized methods in a philosophical attempt to hope to build a culture and a planetary identity in which everyone reconciles, regardless of their cultural characteristics, religious affiliations or pagan composition, and the planetary culture that Moran advocates the restorative endeavor between the ego and the other and in He appreciated that political, cultural, media and religious discourses that encourage hatred are driven by interests and goals that are not innocent and seek to destroy the world so that man becomes a stranger with his race and this is what often leads to insecurity and instability and the creation of public spaces fraught with ridicule and ridicule of the other different, global cultures today are living in a state of moral chaos barbarity, violence, murder, assault, and mostly the Eastern peoples are classified within this shameful circle 'It is this stereotype painted by politicians, artists, businessmen and others that is the main reason for the postponement of historical reconciliation between different subjectivities in religion, language, culture and civilization...Therefore, it is necessary to find available solutions to reduce hate speech, discrimination, unjustified and illegitimate classification of civilizations and peoples, and in this he bets on the need to comply with what he calls a civilized policy, because only it is able to "take upon itself the task of eradicating the barbarism

of human relations, represented by the exploitation of man for Man, the abuse of power, selfishness, ethnic intolerance, cruelty, hatred and incomprehension" and this vision, according to Moran, is in his Able to support the project of mass culture by spreading the culture of recognition and respect for the different in its particularities, regardless of religious, ethnic, linguistic...Moran elaborated on the importance of this universal cultural policy, saying, "mass culture appeals to the emotional preparations of an imaginary universal man who is close to the child and the primitive, but is always present in the Modern Man-Maker." this means that the ambition pursued by the author of the theory of the complex method is the return of mankind to the first primitivism in its simplicity and innocence and its inclination to human and moral values, at the same time preserving civilization and civilization, and thus reaching what is known as humanity Moran called the primitive world the world of passion and the modern world the world of civilization, and modernity in the hope of combining the two worlds into one model is the universal humanistic model based on mass culture, where he said:: "Mass culture intimately unites these two worlds, the world of passion and the world of modernity. through mass culture, it is easy to combine the values of humanity in primitive man with the values of production in modern man." this is how it seemed to Moran when

he saw in real investment in man, by addressing his consciousness and conscience, one of the solutions available to eliminate all obstacles and barriers to building a universal human project imbued with the values of nobility, peace and tolerance, only then is hatred, hatred and violence removed from human souls, and thus living in peace, security and stability, and a summary of what we can say about Edgar Moran's philosophical proposition is that he wants to establish a character. This work depends on the public awareness on the one hand and the global political will on the other hand, so that human rights and the fight against racism and hate speech do not remain just slogans raised in international forums as much as they must turn into a universal reality lived by everyone on the Earth, which has been exhausted by conflicts, wars and violence of various kinds and varieties.

Conclusion:

In the conclusion of this research paper, it is right for us to conclude our study with the set of results that our work has led to on the role of philosophy as a horizon for coexistence under the hate speech that humanity knows in various parts of the world, let's say that hate speech is currently one of the pragmatics behind a set of non-innocent purposes and goals that many different parties and circles are trying to promote and nurture in various ways and Means, and hate speech, regardless of its

source, whether political, cultural or religious, is ultimately a speech hostile to the meaning and significance of humanity because hate speech, as we have observed in research and analysis, is an act, behavior, vision and theory based on coercion. It is a generator of violence, a promoter of conflict, a catalyst for distancing, grinding, fighting and other forms of violence.

Hate speech, which has become a global phenomenon today, has been perpetuated by the efforts of social actors in their various points, which they work on with wide media sponsorship, is a clear indicator of the crisis of relations between people, whether within the framework of different cultures, religions, races among themselves or within the framework of one culture, where hatred spreads between sects, teams, sects, parties, associations, various social sensitivities and organizations.

On the one hand, philosophy is a distinct style of thinking that believes in diversity and multiplicity, but it is its essence and its fulcrum point that has remained present and strongly in the public space where voices encouraging hatred appear, so philosophy was an alternative speech and a voice for the critical mind of all forms of rhetoric motivating violence and hatred. the social dimension of philosophy reflects everything that philosophical practice owes to social conditions, a relationship

that, as we have previously experienced, is revealed only through the history and present of philosophical systems and research in it, as confirmed by the deep presence in search of available solutions in order to overcome the existential crisis left by hate speeches in various forms, the philosopher felt what is organically cultured inside Social and cultural structure that he is required to research the details of these core issues that directly concern humans, because in the end, hatred tends towards insecurity and instability in human existence, and this is an explicit threat to human life.

The philosophical horizon based on the language of peace, coexistence and tolerance is capable of creating new social frameworks, free from all forms of obscurantism, violence, the language of bickering, rejection of the other and dealing with him with the logic of the enemy and unwelcome in the social space. the role of Philosophy Today, we believe, has become more than necessary, but has become a social priority in view of the most important challenges that contemporary man is living today.

Philosophical presence in light of the spread of hate speech is not the solution as much as it is an essential part of the range of available solutions to which religion, society, politics, the media and other fields that are supposed to cooperate interactively in the hope of creating a new

vision that rejects violence and hatred and is prepared to build a universal humanitarian project with the slogan of peace and tolerance.

List of references

- Antonio Guterres .(2019) .*United Nations strategy and action plan on hate speech* .
- Hobbes Thomas .(2011 ,03 01) .the two natural and political origins of state power .
Abu Dhabi authority for culture and heritage Kalma ,p.82
- hudro centre .(2019) .*hudro centre* . hate speeches fuel anger:
www.hrdoegy.ptorg
- Imam Abdel Fattah , Hobes Thomas .(1985) .
philosopher of rationality .cairo:
House of culture for publishing and distribution.
- Jean Paul Sartre .(1998) .*existence and nothingness* .Beirut: House of literature.
- Mohammed Abed al-Jabri .(2007) .issues in contemporary thought .*centre for arab unity studies*.
- Sigmund Freud .(1989) .*Five lessons in psychoanalysis* . Beirut: Vanguard House.
- united nation .(2003) .*report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights* .new york : fifty-eighth session.