

GLOSSA ABOUT HATRED

Dragana Ćorić, PhD¹

Faculty of Law, University of Novi Sad, Serbia

PURPOSE

Everything we do, we do out of fear or love.

Unknown author

The main purpose of this paper is primarily to explore the origin of the emotion of hate and its definitions, which, we believe, is the key for understanding it and reducing this rather negative and destructive feeling. In order to do so, we will firstly attempt a short analysis of the phenomenon of hatred from ancient times until now.

Aristotle in his “Rhetoric” speaks of emotions “as something which leads one’s condition to become so transformed that his judgment is affected, and which is accompanied by pleasure and pain. Examples of emotions include anger, fear, pity, and love, as well as the opposites of these.” (Aristotle, 2017: 34). According to Aristotle, emotions can strongly affect one’s mind and thinking, as well as decisions he makes. On the other hand, Descartes, a proponent of rationalist understanding, separated emotions from cognition, considering them to be the consequences of the movement or doing of the spirit (Solomon: 2008: 1-4), while Spinoza regarded most emotions “as passive reactions to our unwarranted expectations of the world, which will leave us hurt, frustrated, and energized” (Spinoza, 1959: 14). Spinoza got Aristotle’s point of view and connected, once again, emotions with actions and people’s behaviour.

¹ d.coric@pf.uns.ac.rs

Hatred is “the feeling that a subject feels towards a person that he believes to be evil and that threatens some of his values” (Miliivojević, 2000: 300). There must be some conditions fulfilled, from the so-called *cognitive triads of hatred*, to say that hatred exists. In this situation, one person believes that there is someone who significantly jeopardizes some of his high values; that one is going to do so without due cause or justification, and will do that knowingly and intentionally, in order to hurt that person. Psychologists and therapists further believe that if a person believes that there is a justifiable reason for someone’s hostile behaviour towards him, then there is *fear as an emotion*, rather than hatred, and that fear there will be a negative outcome for the person. At the very beginning *we can say that hatred may often originate from excessive or oversized fear*², but this will be elaborated further on below.

It is believed that hatred is an endless *circulus vitiosus* - *a person believes that someone hates him/her and therefore reciprocates with the same feeling*. The other person’s feeling of hatred can be real or presumed, where the counter-hatred with which the first person responds is, in fact, a kind of defence mechanism. With his feelings, a person responds to a presumed stimulus from his environment, which basically contains a huge fear that has become irrational and which is realized in designing and thinking about various destructive activities directed at another person, who is an official object of hatred. All activities are aimed at doing harm to the object of hatred who is believed to hate the person who hates the object of hatred, and thus warn him to harm the first person with his (assumed or real) hatred. The range of activities comes from causing suffering to another person (the object of hatred), inflicting physical injuries, and even causing death.

According to the principle “it is better to hit them first than let others hit me before that”, there are three degrees of destructiveness of these activities. “The first, lowest, degree of destructiveness refers to those behaviours that are symbolically destructive, but that are, relatively, socially acceptable. These include various gossips, petty set-ups and intrigues, etc. Destructive actions of the third degree, which result from hatred, lead to: murder, suicide, madness or severe bodily injuries.” (Miliivojević, 2000: 308) Sometimes a person can come fast from the first to the third degree, or maybe always remain on the first degree³. Or a person can cognitively decide not to take any actions, because he/she realizes that the hatred from another person and also the danger possibly involved do not exist.

2 Fear can be powerful cause for all sorts of human behaviour. As it could be a cause of crime, it could be a cause of doing things properly, as it was researched in the following paper: Ćorić D.: *Ljubav i strah kao materijalni izvor prava*; In: *Ljubav i strah u fokusu interdisciplinarnih istraživanja* : zbornik radova / priredile Zorica Kuburić, Ana Zotova, Ljiljana Čumura, Novi Sad, Centar za empirijska istraživanja religije (CEIR), 2021, 241-252, ISBN 978-86-84111-33-5.

3 In such cases, a person tends to play Games – provoking specific situations which involve other people mostly unwillingly in order to get some emotional gain for oneself.



In psychology, emotions always have their *adequate and inadequate forms* (Milivojević, 2000: 312). It is difficult to imagine that such an emotion as hatred, that is aimed at destruction, should have its adequate - justified form. But it is possible to imagine the context of an extreme situation, in which hatred is the only system of survival, and awakens in a person who hates another person abilities that he/she did not even know he/she possesses, all for the purpose of survival. In such situations, a person who hates will neither feel guilt nor remorse if he/she has committed some horrific acts, because everything is done for the purpose of his/her survival. In all other cases, except the extreme ones mentioned, hatred is an extremely inadequate feeling and needs to be overcome.

When accompanied by a sense of satisfaction of doing justice or defence and protection of one's own value system or even life itself, hatred does not actually bring liberation, because hatred and doing bad things leave scars on another person. The dehumanization of the subject who is hated and the renunciation of his/her human qualities somewhat "facilitates" the process of hatred and the implementation of "punishment" towards him in the form of hate products - all those activities aimed at destroying the object of hatred. Hatred also destroys the one who hates, distorting his/her consciousness and worsening his/her behaviour. So, the more destructive hatred is, the more self-destructive it is at the same time, and it often ends up hurting others and self-harming the person who cultivates that hatred in himself.

It is not uncommon for a social group to be "demonized", which implies the emergence and spread of an ideology which determines that this group is the embodiment of evil. This procedure creates a stereotype of a typical representative of a given group as an inhuman, animal, demonic or satanic creature. What is achieved by this procedure is that the members of that class are not perceived as human beings, and, therefore, morals or any norms that regulate the relations between human beings cannot be applied to them (Milivojević, 2000: 314). This creates a *collective justification* even for undertaking a war, as an extremely destructive force directed at someone who is considered the source of that (real or assumed) evil. As soon as something/somebody endangers survival, everyone who is endangered may have a right to behave in a way that ensures the individual to be able to save himself/herself. Everything done for the purpose of saving one's own life is allowed, even recommended, and completely free of any feeling of guilt. The psychological preparation of a person to do things unimaginable until then to his mind and his feelings, and to feel good and to expect gratitude for that from the wider community, is done by instilling feelings of threat by those who are supposed or trusted to hate that person.

Hatred, as one of the types of *antipathy* (Milivojević, 2000: 316), is diametrically opposed to *sympathy* and *empathy* associated with it. Rightly worried about their

own survival, then quite intimidated, members of the community are subjected to the psychological influence of fear, which grows into its irrational form - hatred and begins to do everything, just to "survive". The physical and / or survival of a particular value system within a community, justifies any kind of aggression used for its own preservation.

The so-called *Cain's complex*, which represents infantile hatred between brothers and sisters (older and younger) (Hughes, 1982:5-22) and has the characteristics of jealousy and envy, often grows into hatred. Parents punish such negative practices that children try to establish. In the same way, states punish similar practices within their legal frameworks, establishing mechanisms for the smooth exercise of rights and freedoms and for punishing discrimination and other violations of rights and freedoms. The state takes on that parental role in relation to its citizens, and sometimes its activity makes some individuals feel threatened, which, in turn, gives them the (primordial) right to defend themselves in every possible way. Even with hatred and hate crimes.

Psychology also knows a specific feeling of self-hatred or *mortido* - when a person denies himself/herself human qualities, because of some things or events occurring in the past, or because of belonging to a certain group or some other internal or external characteristics, and destructive activities aimed at destroying the object of hatred - oneself. In that case, we can simply disgust ourselves (self-loathing), but also react self-destructively, punishing ourselves mentally or physically, all the way to suicide.

There are *different forms of hatred*: autoperpersonal, interpersonal, partner or marital, intra-family, inter-family, intra-group, nationalist, inter-partner, racial and religious hatred. It is important to point out, however, that in each of these cases, hatred changes - mentally and morally - the people who hate (Milivojević, 312). Namely, pathological hatred is often incomprehensible, crazy, passionate, bizarre, malicious and excessive. It is in the function of preserving a pathologically established equilibrium between the individual and his environment. Its functionality is only apparent, because this feeling, sooner or later, leads to the breakdown of adaptation mechanisms (psychological and social), so its consequences are almost always negative, both for the individual and for the environment in which he operates.

We also must make a difference between *hatred and anger*, as their consequences are mostly misinterpreted and replaced. The key difference between anger and hatred is that anger is caused by what we think can be changed (for example, unkind behaviour), while hatred is focused on what is seen as a stable / innate nature and motives for what or whom we hate. For example, "he behaves in a reckless and evil way" (anger) versus "he is reckless and evil" (hatred). This kind of thinking implies a sense of powerlessness, because we cannot change what is stable and innate, and a *sense of powerlessness is a prerequisite for hatred*. In addition to help-

lessness, hatred is also accompanied by feelings of poor control, great obstacles and intense discomfort due to poor treatment, lack of support, humiliation, ignorance or carelessness (Fisher, Halperin, Canetti and Jasini, 2018). Since the object of hatred is attributed with innate and unchangeable traits, haters do not see room for constructive, but only for radical problem-solving.

In a state of *altered consciousness*, both what truly threatens us and what does not threaten us becomes an attack against us as beings and against our value system and quickly and easily falls under the influence of hatred.

The reason we are talking about emotions is the special connection that exists between the emotion of hate and the consequences that could happen under the influence of hate. Those consequences are known as *hate crimes*. "Hate speech is a theory, and hate crime is a practice, i.e., theory of hatred put into practice" (Mršević, Janković, 2022: 14). So legal definitions of hate speech will be mentioned more incidentally, as an additional argument to the basic thesis about fear as a cause of hatred, since their full analysis goes beyond the scope of the current topic of the paper.

After all that has been said, it no longer seems impossible for hatred to be the basis for committing some of the most serious crimes. We can say with certainty *that hatred comes from fear for one's own physical or mental survival*. If that fear can be reduced or overcome, hatred will also be ruled out as the cause of crimes.

METHODS USED/APPROACH

As mentioned in the beginning of the paper, psychological and axiological methods, along with comparative method and deep cognitive analysis would be the basis of our work. Psychological method is useful for understanding the emotion of hate, its origins and psychological consequences it could produce. We use axiological approach to oppose hatred with its consequences to the values of the civilized world, such as freedom, dignity, etc. All together were valuable assets for defining the hypotheses we wanted to explore in this paper and to prove or refute them in the work. Uniqueness of this combination of approaches is that, to the best of our knowledge, it has never been done before, and we hope that it would constitute modest contribution to understanding this topic, both from the legal and psychological points of views.



FINDINGS

1) Fear cannot be defined in legal documents because it is not something that law should deal with. Yet, indirectly, it can be corrective of our behaviour, which directs us to act in accordance with the rules (Ćorić, 2021 :248).

Although generally considered to be a negative or unpleasant feeling, fear can actually be useful because it directs the subject to think differently in certain situations, for which he did not prepare at all (because he did not think they were possible) (Carleton , 2016:8) or did not prepare enough, and to find new solutions. Without fear, we would never, perhaps, think about our new or different behaviour, about changing some of our habits. Fear is an instrument of learning (Olsson, Phelps, 2007: 96)⁴ and preparing individuals for life in a community. Here we find one paradox - fear (of getting caught while doing something bad, or of punishment), which is a negative emotion, can lead us to proper behaviour and, in the end, ensure a harmonious, peaceful society.

2) There are lots of legal definitions of hate crimes in general, especially of hate speech, but fewer legal definition of hatred. On the other side, there are some psychological definitions of hatred, but not so many, because that topic is not pleasant for research. Law is here dependant on psychology and its research.

The characterization of what is 'hateful' is mainly disputed on the basis of different legal, cultural or traditional origins. D. Jovašević states that hatred is explicitly defined by law, in provisions of Article 54a. The Criminal Code of Serbia, which "determines that a criminal offense is committed out of hatred if it involves an action that was undertaken by the perpetrator because of race and religion, national or ethnic origin, sex, sexual orientation or gender identity of another person" (Jovašević, 2022: 97). What underlies hatred is "a special, extremely high degree of conscious and voluntary ability of the perpetrator to achieve relevant criminal consequences in the external world regardless of whether it is accompanied by other psychological elements, such as intention, motive or goal (Radovanović, 1975:184-185 quoted in Jovašević, *ibid.*)".

The definition of "hate" in legal norms is, as in the above mentioned case, mainly restricted to the definition of discrimination⁵, which implies unjustified denial of

4 Olsson, A.; Phelps, E.A. (2007). "Social learning of fear". *Nature Neuroscience*. 10 (9): 1095–1102
5 For example, in Art 387 of the Criminal Code (*Sl. glasnik RS*, br. 85/2005, 88/2005 - ispr., 107/2005 - ispr., 72/2009, 111/2009, 121/2012, 104/2013, 108/2014, 94/2016 and 35/2019), under the title "Racial and other discrimination" we find that violating basic human rights and freedoms on the basis of differences in race, colour, religion, nationality, ethnic origin or any other personal characteristic shall be punished by a term of prison between six months and five years (par.1); that spreading ideas of the superiority of one race over another or propagating racial hatred or inciting racial discrimination, shall be punished by imprisonment for a term between three months and three years (par.3) and that disseminating or otherwise making publicly available texts, images



certain rights to persons based on sex, age, religion, nationality, etc. But in Law on prohibition of discrimination (*Sl. glasnik RS*, br. 22/2009-3, 52/2021-4) in Art. 11 we find a wider definition of hate speech: it encompasses acts of discrimination, hatred or violence, listing a large number of ways in which hate speech as such can be disseminated:

It is forbidden to express ideas, information and opinions that incite discrimination, hatred or violence against a person or a group of persons because of their personal characteristics, in public newspapers and other publications, at gatherings and places accessible to the public, by writing and displaying messages or symbols and in other ways.

A much wider definition is found in Appendix to Recommendation No. R (97) 20 of The Committee of Ministers to Member States on "Hate Speech" (Strasbourg, July 2015), where hate speech covers:

all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin⁶.

But only in the explanation of D. Jovašević can we find an explicit connection between the consequences of hate speech and hatred itself. The interesting point here is that this notion of hatred goes beyond the usual defining of hate speech as discrimination acts, and is extended to all cases in which a perpetrator has done something willingly to cause harm to somebody else in external world, whether or not there is any psychological cause underlying the perpetrator's actions.

or any other representation of ideas or theories that advocate or incite hatred, discrimination or violence against any person or group of persons based on race, colour, religion, nationality, ethnic origin or any other personal characteristic shall also be punished (par. 4). Public approval of the mentioned activities (par.5) and public threatening (par.6) to perform any of the mentioned acts is also punishable. As we can see, hatred is explicitly mentioned in paragraph 3, as "racial hatred", which is probably considered here as the most common form of hate crimes, and in paragraph 4, as a possibility to incite hatred in some cases. However, the penalties are not so severe at all, they have in mind the impact that such activities, behaviours and statements can have on the formation of attitudes of individuals and groups in society. Combined with causing grievous bodily harm or causing death, sentences can be more severe, in terms of longer prison sentences, but sometimes it is not enough "re-education" for those planning to commit such activities.

6 In regard to this definition of hate speech, the definition in domestic Law on public information and media (*Sl. glasnik RS*, br. 83/2014, 58/2015 and 12/2016) in Article 75 is narrower:

"Ideas, opinions, or information published in the media must not encourage discrimination, hatred or violence against a person or group of persons because of their belonging or non-belonging to a race, religion, nation, gender, because of their sexual orientation or other personal characteristics, regardless of whether the crime was committed by publishing."



Having in mind that profession of a journalist is very responsible due to the transmission of information and their own views regarding some events, as it influences the creation of citizens' attitudes, it is important to mention that *The Code of Ethics of Journalists*⁷ in Serbia has special provisions that strictly prohibit hate speech, or transmission of journalists' own prejudices to all those to whom they transmit information. The danger of spreading hate speech is the greatest here, because journalists, outside of their work, are just people with their own emotions, fears that can overcome them, despite all the professionalism they cultivate in their profession. So, when transmitting such news, we may say that journalists commit not only hate speech, but they commit – hate crime. Also, having in mind that – by means of their writings/speech – journalists can motivate large numbers of people and encourage them to fight with each other (Čok, 1994:351), hatred here is used as a rather powerful weapon.

The term *hate speech* is mostly understood as “any kind of communication in speech, writing or behaviour, that attacks or uses pejorative or discriminatory language with reference to a person or a group on the basis of who they are, in other words, based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, colour, descent, gender or other identity factor” (according to United Nations Strategy and Plan on Hate Speech, 2019). Hate speech is therefore connected to hatred as a feeling of deep *fear* for one's future and belief that it could be and probably will be endangered by activities of those individuals or groups to whom this hate speech is directed, which is also clearly stated in the UN Strategy and Plan on Hate Speech, as follows : “‘hatred’ and ‘hostility’ refer to intense and irrational emotions of opprobrium, enmity and detestation towards the target group” (United Nations Strategy and Plan on Hate Speech, 2019).

As to the psychological view on this topic, hatred is considered to be the most destructive feeling in the history of human nature (Royzman, McCauley, & Rozin, 2005). Hate research is relatively rare in psychology, and the reasons for this are both methodological and conceptual. Young people, who are mostly participants in these experiments, usually say that they have not had any experience of hatred ever in their life, or they have not had the capacity to recognize it as hatred. Conceptually, hatred is not considered as a common emotion, so it is not popularly researched, like the feelings of disgust, anger or sadness. Rising levels of hatred in various societies and lives of all people today – the so-called *hate culture* – changes this situation because hatred has serious consequences for the health of the nation, as well as the emotional, psychological and physical health of the individual. It must be noted that proponents of this hate culture are mostly young people (Ćorić, 2022: 240). They are the same age group that claim not to have experi-

⁷ Available on : <https://savetzastampu.rs/en/documents/kodeks-novinara-srbije/>, link retrieved on 10th July 2022.



ence with hatred, so it could be that they are therefore a suitable ground for the development of this - as they do not dig too deep into this topic. Also, the lack of emotional education and failures in developing the ability to empathize have made young people possible perpetrators of acts of hatred, which they are not even aware of as such.

To conclude: the lack of a comprehensive definition of hatred in law is directly caused by the inconvenience of researching and dealing with this topic in psychology and other social sciences. As the law relies on the knowledge of other sciences in this part, we come across incomplete definitions of hatred, which lead to hatred being mostly equated with discrimination, although discrimination is one of the consequences of the emotion of hatred. This conclusion does not undermine the significance of all definitions of forms of hatred, especially in the case of hate speech. A variety of definitions of hate speech, some of which are presented in the paper testify to great awareness about this problem and a high level of determination of countries and the international community to suppress such activities more than ever.

3. People are afraid of something that they have never experienced before, that they do not understand or they rely on the experience of *Significant Others* in their lives (Čorić, 2021 :249). Therefore, fear can be truly the root of hatred, which is presumably often connected to lack of understanding of differences.

The social contract theory made the humanity stronger and at the same time vulnerable to external stimuli that are currently unknown to it. From its very beginning, the social contract theory wanted to establish a safer, better community for all willing to live in that community (D'Agostino, et alia, 2021). All others, who did not share the same vision of society and didn't want to obey the proposed rules of conduct were considered as those who decided to remain in their natural state, the state of wilderness and constant danger⁸. The social contract state is opposed to the natural, aggressive and dangerous 'state'. It has been used as a way to tame the disobedient, and to establish an order that suits a number of members of the community, by intimidating them with the world that has remained outside its borders. Those who are born in the social contract state do not have memories of the past; so, their fear of disrupting such a community is becoming stronger with each generation. Paradoxically, in the 21st century we, as a humanity, are confronted with similar challenges as the ones prevalent at the time when this theory emerged in the 16th century⁹. Now, any difference and departure from the

8 Celeste Friend, Social Contract Theory, available on: <https://iep.utm.edu/soc-cont/>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

9 The idea of the social contract goes back to Protagoras and Epicurus, but it was revived by Thomas Hobbes and subsequently developed, in different ways, by John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Immanuel Kant.



majority population is considered as a type of natural state and behaviour that threatens to endanger the existing and known way of life. It is less common to think that differences can enrich and strengthen an already existing community.

4. Instead of improving the way the facts are obtained, the Internet has increased the ways in which false information is obtained. It increases fear and thus the hatred that grows in certain communities, especially where certain authorities are blindly trusted¹⁰.

We strongly believe that simply establishing the facts and circumstances of a case/situation, verifying the truthfulness of the content that comes to each of us, which is facilitated by the existence of the Internet and limitless sources and ways of verifying information, as well as ceasing to generalize and attribute to the whole group something that causes hatred, as the main cause of all hate crimes, could prevent the spreading of these adverse phenomena. Not understanding something we encounter for the first time induces fear for mere existence in every human being, no matter what social or political position he/she finds himself/herself in. Therefore, every one of us must find enough time and make more efforts in order to explain the situations before us. Thorough explanation of everything that is different, seen for the first time, etc., could be crucial for reducing fear and reducing hatred at the same time.

Also, we must be willing to adopt *“coming to the truth”* as the basic principle of our own actions. Believing in information *“on the first click”*, without asking questions like *“exactly who”*¹¹, *“are you sure that all of them are the same or this is only one man/woman/small group behaving badly”*, can certainly be the beginning of entering a specific game of hatred from which it is difficult to get out. Legislative frames, national and international¹² can be good allies in this demanding struggle,

10 Authority does not necessarily mean the competent state bodies, but it can be any individual who is “influential” in any way and on any grounds in one part of the population.

11 According to the authors of the article “The spread of true and false news online”, false political news were diffused more quickly and more profoundly, and reached more than 20,000 people nearly three times faster than all other types of false news reached 10,000 people.” People thrive on novelty. Novelty attracts human attention, contributes to productive decision making, and encourages information-sharing. In essence, it can update our understanding of the world. When information is novel, it is not only surprising, but also more valuable - both from the information theory perspective (it provides the greatest aid to decision-making) and from a social perspective (it conveys social status that one is ‘in the know’ or has access to unique ‘inside’ information). Falsity of news, when the content is full of hatred can generate a new wave of fear for stability of one’s community. The spiral of aggression is present, and soon it starts spinning. More about it: Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, Sinan Aral, “The Spread of True and False News Online”, Science, 2018, Vol 359, Issue 6380, pp. 1146-1151.

12 One of the most valuable international documents here is ECRI General Policy Recommendation No.6 on combating the dissemination of racist, xenophobic and antisemitic material via the Internet adopted on 15 December 2000, which specially takes into account combating racism, xenophobia



but it is up to one's own moral standings, willingness to live in a community and accept all compromises that are necessarily made for the sake of a more stable life in that community. Otherwise, there will not be punishments terrifying enough to deter some very frightened people from committing much more serious crimes in fear that they themselves have been in real danger. The truth is an important social and legal value, which is not that easy to get, but every effort is important.

5, What should be done in order to prevent hatred and reduce the number of crimes inspired by it? Coordinated work of individuals, groups and national and international bodies can improve the picture that is prevalent today.

The *United Nations* decided to make more efforts in emphasizing the responsibility of all actors (individuals, groups, national governmental bodies and international entities) and preventing hate speech by ensuring that young people in particular should be able to recognize what can truly harm them, and how to recognize speech and activities that come out of hatred¹³. All channels of communication, especially digital, should be used properly, for educational purposes. Unfortunately, the internet has become a place for the rapid spread of all kinds of information, especially false information, and superficiality in accessing all information and verifying its truthfulness is worrying. It can be said that this superficiality and non-verification of the truthfulness of information has led in part to an increase in the fear of certain individuals and groups for their own safety and to the creation of new forms of hate crimes.

Also, the UN established the so-called *threshold test* in order to help individuals, groups, and countries to recognize hate crimes and eventually hate speech (Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, 2013). The test was based on the general ban on hate speech and other forms of hate crimes, based on Art. 20 of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) and takes into account:

- *the context of the statement* (suggests thorough analysis; the speech act within the social and political context prevalent at the time the speech was made and disseminated may not have been delivered with hatred);
- *speaker* (his/her status, position and especially political or social significance at the very moment that the speech is given);

and antisemitism on the Internet; full text : <https://rm.coe.int/ecri-general-policy-recommendation-no-6-on-combating-the-dissemination/16808b5a8d>, link retrieved : 10th July 2022.

13 Stopping hate speech spread via Internet tops agenda of the UN anti-racism committee, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2013/08/446592-stopping-hate-speech-spread-internet-tops-agenda-un-anti-racism-committee>, link retrieved : 10th July 2022; special section "Fight Racism" on the official site of the United Nations: <https://www.un.org/en/fight-racism>, link retrieved on 10th July 2022.



- *what was the intent* (if there is just negligence or recklessness, there will be no hate crime or hate speech);
- *what was the true content and form of the speech and in what occasion it was given*;
- *extent of the speech*, or how large was the audience that speech was given to and what was the manner of delivering the speech (whether it was given live, on the internet or in combination of those two), how wide was the audience;
- and finally, *was there any risk of harm that could be done thru that speech* and that could provoke any dangerous actions against other individuals or groups.

When all or most of these conditions are met, hate speech exists.

ORIGINALITY/VALUE OF THE WORK

In this paper, we tried to approach the topic of hate crimes from a completely different side, more from the psychological (or emotional) side, trying to understand the true origins of hatred- which is the emotion of fear. We did the analysis of some chosen legal documents and many of definitions of hate crimes that they offer, but we wanted to approach hatred directly as the cause of those violent acts. So, this paper should be taken mostly as psychological one, then legal. We hope that this short overview of the topic of hatred will be taken as an attempt at understanding origins of hate crimes and hatred as such, which might result in thinking about possible solutions for combating hatred. Unique, different approach to this topic might inspire some new researchers and new results, different from all created so far.

REFERENCES:

- Aristotel (2017), *Retorika*, Beograd.
- Carleton. R.N., Fear of the unknown: One fear to rule them all? In: *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, Vol. 41, June 2016, 5-21.
- Čok V.(1994), *Ugrožavanje prava čoveka govorom mržnje*, *Jugoslovenska revija za međunarodno pravo*, Vol. 41, 3/1994, str. 350-375.
- Ćorić D. (2021), *Ljubav i strah kao materijalni izvor prava*; U: *Ljubav i strah u fokusu interdisciplinarnih istraživanja : zbornik radova / priredile Zorica Kuburić, Ana Zotova, Ljiljana Ćumura*, Novi Sad, Centar za empirijska istraživanja religije (CEIR),241-252.
- Ćorić D.(2022), *Aleksin zakon; 5 godina kasnije – zašto i dalje odričemo postojanje vršnjačkog nasilja u školama*; U: *Nasilje i deca / urednik Mina Zirojević*, Beograd, Institut za uporedno pravo, 93-105.



- D'Agostino, F., Gaus, G., Thrasher, J. (2021), "Contemporary Approaches to the Social Contract", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/contractarianism-contemporary/>
- Dekart, R. (2017), Geometrija, Beograd.
- Fischer, A., Halperin, E., Canetti, D., & Jasini, A. (2018). Why we hate. *Emotion Review*, 10(4), 309–320.
- Hughes R. (1982), The Cain Complex and the Apostle Paul, *An Interdisciplinary Journal* Vol. 65, No. 1, 5-22.
- Jovašević, D. (2022), krivična odgovornost i kažnjivost za govor mržnje, *Zbornik radova „Govor mržnje“*, Pokrajinski zaštitnik građana – ombudsman i Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, 93-111.
- Mršević, Z., Janković, S. (2022), Uloga nezavisnih institucija u Srbiji u slučajevima govora mržnje, *Zbornik radova Govor mržnje*, Pokrajinski zaštitnik građana – ombudsman i Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, 14-26.
- Olsson, A.; Phelps, E.A. (2007). "Social learning of fear". *Nature Neuroscience*. 10 (9): 1095–1102
- Spinoza, B. De (1959), *Etika*, geometrijskim redom izložena i u pet delova podeljena, Beograd,
- Solomon, R. C. (1977). The rationality of the emotions. *The Southwestern Journal of Philosophy*, 8, 105–114
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., Aral, S., (2018), The Spread of True and False News Online, *Science*, Vol 359, Issue 6380, 1146-1151.
- Royzman, E. B., McCauley, C., & Rozin, P. (2005). From Plato to Putnam: Four ways to think about hate. In: R. J. Sternberg (Ur.), *The psychology of hate* (pp. 3–35). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

LEGAL ACTS:

- ECRI General Policy Recommendation No.6 on combating the dissemination of racist, xenophobic and antisemitic material via the Internet, <https://rm.coe.int/ecri-general-policy-recommendation-no-6-on-combating-the-dissemination/16808b5a8d>
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>



Krivični zakonik Republike Srbije (Criminal Code of the Republic of Serbia), *Sl. glasnik RS*, br. 85/2005, 88/2005 - ispr., 107/2005 - ispr., 72/2009, 111/2009, 121/2012, 104/2013, 108/2014, 94/2016 and 35/2019

Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, available on: <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G13/101/48/PDF/G1310148.pdf?OpenElement>

Recommendation No. R (97) 20 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on "hate speech", in "Recommendations and Declarations of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in the field of media and information society", Media and Internet Division - Directorate General of Human Rights and Rule of Law, Strasbourg, July 2015

The Code of Ethics of Journalists at <https://savetzastampu.rs/en/documents/kodeks-novinara-srbije/>,

United Nations Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech, 2019, available at: https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/advising-and-mobilizing/Action_plan_on_hate_speech_EN.pdf

Zakon o javnom informisanju i medijima, *Sl. glasnik RS*, br. 83/2014, 58/2015 i 12/2016 - autentično tumačenje)

Zakon o zabrani diskriminacije (*Sl. glasnik RS*, br. 22/09 i 52/21)

LINKS

Celeste Friend, Social Contract Theory, <https://iep.utm.edu/soc-cont/>

"Fight Racism" on official site of United Nations : <https://www.un.org/en/fight-racism>

Launching the new Strategy against Hate Speech, <https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/hate-speech-strategy.shtml>

Stopping hate speech spread via Internet tops agenda of UN anti-racism committee, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2013/08/446592-stopping-hate-speech-spread-internet-tops-agenda-un-anti-racism-committee>,

