

**Media Freedom Status in Jordan  
2013**

# **Electronic Blackout**

**Executive Summary**



## Media Freedom Status in Jordan 2013

---



## Stigma (The Mark of Shame)

NIDAL MANSOUR



As if on a stage where the lights go out suddenly, you are gripped by fear, you feel your body and your head, your fear that someone may take you by surprise, because you cannot see... and one who does not see may not know.

This is what happened in Jordan ... suddenly and without introduction and despite all promises, the government decided to extinguish the light of 291 websites by blocking them from the public.

In the government's decision, there was neither a middle ground nor options. You could either go meekly to get a license for your website or remain blocked forever... This was, in short, the net achievement of the media scene in 2013!

"Electronic Blackout" filled the cyber after the candles of the websites had lit the road to media freedom in the past few years... The websites were inspired by the wisdom that: "Lighting a candle is better than cursing the darkness"... and so they did... they defeated the censor's scissors, which dominated the media for decades, escaped the grip of the government and before it, that of security services, and they overcame the fear that settled in the hearts and minds of journalists and made them censor their pens and break their nibs more ruthlessly than all the orders and taboos!

"When the Arab Spring began to crumble, the castle of freedom built by journalists with their struggle, patience and blood began also to Autumn apart... the Autumn came quickly upon the media in Jordan...spring passed as quickly as the batting of an eyelid.

The freedom that was promised and which we awaited and celebrated when people raised their voices calling for reform, justice and democracy was derailed. It did not complete its journey. The blossom did not bloom. The walls that had besieged our dreams and our pens were erected again... Was our dream of spring a mere illusion... a false dream?!

To the beat of the retreat of Public movment and the surrender of the media to the system that had dominated it for long decades, we stumbled... then we fell... therefore the result Was going backwards!

In 2012, we dominated the "gray area." Everything remained in suspension and unresolved. The freedoms that journalists snatched were sometimes confiscated

## Prelude

and other times accepted.

This situation, this reality, used to upset us... But now, in 2013, we are all shrouded in black. We have abandoned the leadership even of the gray area.

The decision to block websites was a mark of shame that cannot be forgiven or erased from the government's record or the memory of the media and the people. It will remain a stigma that haunts Jordan in international reports, as the country that invented a law and tailored it in order to license virtual space.

After the government's decision to tighten its grip on cyberspace, all the details have become a foregone conclusion. The talk about "freedom whose upper limit is the sky" became a dream and a lamentation that hurts journalists, or sometimes it is the subject of their jokes.

Between two scenes, or two situations that the media lived, which were not far apart in time, we search for the mosaic of the new reality... and a return to a recent past. At the start of the popular movement, the media broke many taboos and crossed many red lines. The independent had a new voice that was able to break through the wall and the blockade. On the banks of this scene rose the banners of freedom and deliverance from the time of tyranny.

In the other scene, less than two years later, the hands of the clock were rushing backwards. The freedom that had escaped from incarceration was forcibly returned to house arrest. The ghost that set the tempo of the media came back without shame or equivocation, and it came in through the door not through the window. The trumpets whose cacophony stopped for a short time, now have a roar which has become a familiar sound that awakens those who dream of a different media scene. Now, we yearn for the days when we were in the "gray area"... "if only we had accepted the crumbs of their margins instead of coming back to being tethered to the grindstone, going round and round.

There are no longer two voices, a thesis and an antithesis vying with one another, as we wait for the emergence of a synthesis. The situation has been resolved in favor of a single note that prevails unchallenged. The picture that was multi-faceted now has one face, even though the mirrors may change.

Last year's cover story was "Suppression by Force of Law"... The situation continued, became more established and worse. The government's domination through the law's suppression of freedoms was boosted by journalists' fear for their daily bread and their future.

The equation of bread and freedom prevailed in the media and overshadowed everything else... The logical question that was frequently asked is: Which is more sublime; bread or freedom? Which comes first? Which is the result of the other?!

When journalists became mired in the minutiae of their search for their daily bread... the

story of those who search for freedom was lost... This is what they said publicly... How do you expect someone who cannot find sustenance at his home to be at the forefront of those demanding freedom for themselves and for society?

Others answered, if you want to earn your bread and you do not want it to be stolen from you, first you should look for your freedom. This debate continued to rage unresolved. Governments shirk their responsibilities and turn a deaf ear to those who accuse them of being behind the crisis of the media!

After The stigma, which the government produced by blocking websites, we moved to the time of black tragedy when some daily newspapers stopped publication and hundreds of people working in the media suffered arbitrary termination and dismissal.

For the first time in the history of Jordan, the media launched its longest protests, starting with the protest tent against the closure of Alarab Alyawm (Arabic daily newspaper), then the tent of Alrai (Arabic daily newspaper) employees, which escalated to the point of suspending publication, and finally the protest tent of Addustour (Arabic daily newspaper), which is threatened with closure.

The grave violations which journalists suffered at the start of the popular movement dropped to be replaced by mass violations such as blocking electronic media and stopping publication of print media. These violations do not cause cuts or bleeding, but they are not less dangerous or painful.

In parallel with these signs of a general crisis, other forms of violations continue to haunt journalists to the point where they have become an obsession that hinders their work. Withholding information has not stopped; mandatory control over the media continues, and it is now managed by 'remote control' through the leaders of some media organizations.

This pessimistic outlook on the state of the media in Jordan can be found in all its details in the Media Freedom Status in Jordan Report and in journalists' answers to the opinion poll. It is exposed through monitoring and documenting violations and manifested in the hate speech which is growing and which offers no promise of freedom and reform.

The result... 2013 delivered a painful defeat for media freedom. The biggest loser was Jordan and its image as a country that protects freedom. Is there a window of hope to repair what the authorities have destroyed with ruthlessness and recklessness?!





# Introduction

The Media Freedom Status in Jordan Report is a spot light that shows a snapshot of the media, its problems and their implications, as well as violations against the media in 2013.

Thirteen years have passed since the Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ) started to publish this report, which is the first reference point in measuring the state of media freedoms in Jordan. CDFJ continues to develop the report to make it reveal faithfully the details of the media scene based on the legacy and experience of the past years, and the efforts of experts who worked hard throughout the year to help this report see the light.

In its thirteenth year, the report uses different methodologies to tell the truth about media freedom. It continues to conduct an opinion poll of journalists, which amounts to a comprehensive census of journalists' views, outlooks, and assessments of the state of media in general. The questionnaire is reviewed every year to bring it into sharper focus and add questions pertaining to the past year's developments that affected the lives of journalists.

The report expresses the opinions of journalists. It inquires about their assessment of media freedom, the state of legislation and whether journalists perceive that the laws restrict or support their freedom at work, takes a look at government practices in dealing with media, discusses self-censorship and its causes, examines corruption in the media industry, its implications and impact on professional practices, and asks journalists about the violations and problems they

faced.

The survey measures the opinion of journalists, their attitudes in dealing with hot issues that caught the public attention and their orientation in dealing with these issues.

The poll, conducted by CDFJ in cooperation with a specialized polling company, can be described as a "barometer" that measures the mood of journalists throughout the year.

Every year, the poll selects a Jordanian hot issue that may have ramifications in the Arab world and asks journalists about it. This year, the theme was 'the hate speech' which has spread in the Arab media and that is clearly reflected in the Jordanian media as it passes through what the Arab Spring calls a severe crisis.

The second component of the report is monitoring and documenting violations against journalists in Jordan. This is a fundamental and consistent aspect of CDFJ's work and its role in the defense and protection of journalists.

Since 2012 after the launch of the Network for Media Freedom Defenders in the Arab World (SANAD), which is run by CDFJ, monitoring and documentation have become an Arabic effort conducted by national teams in the context of the 'Ain' Program for Monitoring and Documentation of Violations against Media Freedoms. Jordan, acting through CDFJ, was the leader in this effort. It worked to institutionalize the Ain Unit for Monitoring and Documentation as a twin branch for the activities of Media Legal Aid Unit (MELAD).

# Introduction

The methodology of monitoring and documentation in the Media Freedom Status in Jordan Report uses the same approach that is based on the international standards for human rights. It is not limited to describing the nature of the violation, but also links it to the right that is violated.

Documentation is an advanced step that follows monitoring. It depends on interviewing victims and collecting evidence to prove that the violation occurred, not for issuing reports and condemnations, but to prosecute violators, so they do not escape punishment.

In-depth research is the third pillar of the Media Freedom Status in Jordan report. This year, the goal was to shed light on 'hate speech', which grew in the media of the Arab world and found resonance in the Jordanian media.

The state of optimism that grew on the banks of the Arab Spring turned into a clash in the media due to political polarization and sectarian mobilization. The result was media content that does not advocate tolerance nor conveys facts, but disseminates divisiveness and hatred.

This report will only include a summary of the study on the 'hate speech'. In view of the study's importance, it will be printed independently in order to publish and distribute it better, so its benefit can be more pervasive.

## 1. Opinion Survey of Journalists

The Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ) continued to develop

the questionnaire form of the journalists' opinion survey, as it does every year, to keep pace with developments and changes in the media landscape and the community of journalists in Jordan. The 2013 survey form included 390 questions spread over eight main sections, which aim to measure Jordanian journalists' assessment of media freedom in its different dimensions. Nearly 460 respondents that included journalists from the private and public sectors participated in the survey.

The survey sought to measure journalists' satisfaction with legislation related to media, its impact on media freedoms, methods of containment, inducements offered to them in the course of their work as journalists and the extent to which phenomena, such as nepotism, bribery, extortion... etc., are widespread in the community of journalists and violations against journalists such as the arrests and trials in 2013. The survey also sought to develop an understanding of the problems and pressures faced by journalists, as well as self-censorship and the extent to which journalists submit to it. Another section of the survey focused on revolutions and protest movements that emerged in the Arab Spring and their impact on media freedom.

A new section was introduced that focuses on the hate speech in the Arab media, which spread after the division and polarization in the media following developments in the Arab Spring. This section's questions aimed to identify the extent to which the Jordanian media helped promote hate speech in the media of other Arab countries such as Egypt, Tunisia and Syria.

The survey questionnaire included questions designed to identify the following:

- The degree of satisfaction of journalists in different positions and sectors with the state of media freedoms in Jordan.
- The opinions of journalists with the performance of government and private media organizations.
- The impact of legislation and legislative amendments related to the media on media freedom.
- Developments in the electronic media.
- Attempts to contain journalists and their impact on the orientations of journalists.
- The extent to which phenomena such as nepotism, bribery, and others are prevalent in different sectors of media.
- Violations that occurred in 2013 and opinions of journalists on them.
- Change in self-censorship.
- The impact of protest movements and revolutions on media work in the context of the Arab Spring.
- The contribution of media outlets in promoting the hate speech in media.

## 2. Complaints and Violations

Chapter II of the report highlights the

most important violations recorded and documented by the «Ain» monitors. These are not all the violations that were documented by the Unit, but the most prominent ones to which journalists were subjected in a tangible and clear manner.

One noticeable result of monitoring and documenting violations against journalists in Jordan was the clear decrease in the incidents of widespread and systematic gross violations that Jordan saw in 2011 at the start of popular activism that coincided with the revolutions and protests that swept the Arab world. Ain, which is part of the Network for Media Freedom Defenders in the Arab World (SANAD) believes that the logical explanation of the decrease in this type of violations, which was not common in Jordan in the past decades, was the decline of demonstrations and protests in the Jordanian street. Fewer demonstrations meant that journalists were less frequently present in hot areas of tension and friction, which made them vulnerable to deliberate and systematic as well as accidental attacks.

However, violations in general did not decrease. Withholding of information and interventions continue to take place. The most prominent violation was the enactment by the government of the Press and Publications Law, which caused 291 websites to be blocked. This was a broad collective violation, contrary to the standards of media freedom and freedom of the Internet. Despite government pledges after the enactment of the Press and Publications Law to limit trials of journalists to cases based on the Press and Publications Law, journalists were detained and referred to the State Security Court.

# Introduction

The issue that preoccupied journalists most was job security, after the Arabic daily newspaper Alarab Alyawm closed and terminated the services of most of its staff whose number was more than 200 journalists and employees. This decision was followed by a long protest in front of the newspaper by its employees against non-payment of their salaries and financial entitlements.

The crisis of Alarab Alyawm had hardly faded from the scene when employees of Arabic daily newspaper Alrai erected their tent protesting against the refusal of the newspaper's management to comply with a labor agreement signed by them in 2011. The protest at Alrai escalated to demands for the dismissal of the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors, and journalists stopped publishing any news related to the Prime Minister and members of the Council of Ministers. The crisis deepened when employees decided to stop publication of the newspaper for one day, which was considered the most dangerous indicator of the print media's crisis. This prompted parliamentary deputies and public figures to intervene to contain the crisis, which did not stop until the Board of Directors was dismissed and the government pledged to implement the labor agreement. In the meantime, the crisis at Arabic daily newspaper Addustour was open to all possibilities because of the deteriorating financial position of the newspaper and the failure to pay employees' salaries on time.

The state of media freedoms in Jordan in 2013 was marked by a severe reversal. The government besieged the media, especially the electronic media, by

enacting the amendments to the Press and Publications Law, which led to the closure of a large number of them. The government also continued to dominate the official media in its various forms. There were several cases where journalists were referred to the courts, particularly to the State Security Court for trial on the basis of the Penal Code for material they published in the media.

Despite the significant and clear decline in the state of media freedom in Jordan, the number of cases that «Ain» succeeded in monitoring, documenting, and verifying revealed a number of diverse violations that infringe on journalists' rights and media freedom in Jordan. Out of 99 forms received by the Unit in 2013, 60 forms involved a violation of one or more media freedoms or journalists' rights.

As a result of the study and analysis of the cases monitored by «Ain», it transpired that there are a number of general trends similar in part to trends revealed last year, in addition to new trends that emerged in 2013. These general trends can be summarized as follows:

- A clear return by journalists to the practice of not reporting violations.
- Erosion of job security for journalists and its impact on the practice of media freedoms.
- A retreat in the role of print media to the benefit of electronic media.
- A preference among journalists for conciliatory solutions instead of legal solutions.

- Diversity and widening scope of the problems involved in the cases.
- Lack of knowledge of the legal and legislative systems related to media freedom.

The report shows the basic trends of violations of media freedoms and the rights of journalists in Jordan. There was a decrease in the number of violations such as preventing coverage, detention of journalists, and trial of journalists before the State Security Court, which does not provide guarantees of a fair trial, particularly the independence of the court itself. Jordan has continued to pursue a policy of using the law as a tool for suppressing freedoms and muzzling and narrowing the freedom of the media. It has also continued the policy of impunity and hiding the identity of violators. In general, it can be said that official and government control of media has increased. It was manifested in the severe tightening of the freedom of electronic media and amendments to the laws governing the work of media in ways that flagrantly devastates its freedom. The report addresses the above issues as follows:

- Decline in media freedoms.
- Decrease in the number of grievous violations.
- Continuation of the policy of impunity and lack of accountability of the culprits.
- Trial of journalists before the State Security Court.
- Frequent cases of preventing coverage

by security agencies.

- The return to self-censorship among journalists.

These violations include those that occurred and violated media freedoms and the rights of journalists as a result of certain acts and practices (violations resulting from practices) and as a result of the operative legislation and laws in force. These violations were classified in the report according to their most visible form although they may involve violations of other rights or freedoms. They can be summarized as follows:

- Violations related to the right not to be subjected to torture or other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.
- Violations related to the right to a fair trial.
- Violations related to the right to personal freedom.
- Violations related to freedom of expression publication and information.

### 3. Studies and Research

The purpose of the study, "I Hate You... the Hate Speech and Sectarianism in the Media of the Arab Spring" is to explore the form and content of the hate speech, sectarian incitement, and discrimination in the media of the Arab Spring, and measure the extent of these media's commitment to international and professional standards, and the extent of their involvement in the political and sectarian conflicts in the

countries of the Arab Spring.

The study found that the hate speech in the media of the Arab Spring was not incidental or improvised. It simply became more prominent and pressing in the period of revolutions and popular protests and its aftermath. It shifted from being a potential or latent discourse to one that is very visible, pressing, and very dangerous. It is also no longer limited to countries that had revolutions and conflicts with the local regime; it swept through all the Arab countries; it spread and ramified widely and became a dangerous tool for incitement against the other. This discourse appears to be the principal mover of Arab politicians and the public, particularly in Arab states that passed through a transition from the old to the new regimes and have not yet achieved real stability, Egypt, Tunisia, and Yemen.

The study affirmed that sectarian discourse was employed by existing regimes against popular protests, describing them as sectarian and confessional protests in order to isolate and deface them and deprive them of popular support, as in Bahrain, for instance. The hate speech has become stronger in facing the other in order to exclude and alienate him, as in Egypt and Syria.

The study includes seven chapters: the first chapter looks at the concepts involved in the hate speech from international law to local laws, and stops before those that oppose the hate speech and incitement in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In the third chapter, entitled “Why do They Hate Us... the Roots of the Hate Speech between East and West,” the study argues that Arab culture did not develop a hate speech such as that generated by political conflicts between Arabs and the West throughout the twentieth century. Arab hatred of the West did not materialize clearly and effectively except when the United States and the West in general sided with the Israeli occupation, refusing to support the Palestinian people in their just cause against Israeli occupation. Then Washington DC suffered the September attack and led the world in its war against Afghanistan and Iraq, in addition to the media revolution in its successive waves, which opened the doors to the hate speech that we see and suffer from its consequences.

The fourth chapter of the study discusses “Political Islam, the hate speech, denial of the other and incitement against him.” It affirms that the religious discourse of Islamic movements and the political discourse of official Arab regimes have been a fertile incubator that nurtured the hate speech in past few years, especially after the years of the Arab Spring. This fact, unfortunately, appeared to be more than a living reality.

The study discusses in the fifth chapter reports that monitored the hate speech in the media of the Arab Spring countries. The chapter starts by analyzing the means and mechanisms of identifying the hate speech and distinguishing it from the freedom of expression by applying the six-part test that was adopted in the Rabat plan of action and by Article 19, which gives consideration to the broader societal

context of the publication; the author or publisher who controls the means of disseminating it to the audience; the intent of the speaker; the content of the publication; the publication's size, general nature, and likelihood of spreading it; the imminence of the advocated action occurring.

The study dedicated the sixth chapter to analyzing the survey on the impact of revolutions and protest movements in promoting hate speech in the media. The survey aimed to identify the views of the target sample regarding hate speech in the media of Egypt, Syria, Tunisia, and Jordan; their assessment of this speech, its causes and motives; the impact of internal conflicts and popular movements

in Arab Spring countries; and whether Arab revolutions contributed positively or negatively to promoting hate speech based on these conflicts.

Chapter seven, the final chapter, studies hate speech in the Jordanian media, and the nexus between religious tolerance and hatred. The chapter studies the concept and content of hate speech in the Jordanian legislation and concludes that the Jordanian legislation does not use explicitly the term "hate" in its multiplicity of texts. Instead, it uses terms and descriptions which constitute, in their essence, part of the elements of hate speech, such as incitement, degradation, inequality and other descriptions connected to hate speech.





# Executive Summary





# Executive Summary

## First: Opinion Survey

With the retreat of the popular movement in Jordan, there was a steady retreat in indicators of journalists' confidence that media freedom in their countries is advancing. Clearly, the confidence of journalists grew with the so-called Arab Spring in 2011, as did their rising sense that they held the initiative; [but] their independence began to fall apart last year and it continued to decline in 2013.

Figures from the poll conducted by the Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ) for 2013 reflect this: 21.3% of journalists believe that media freedom retreated dramatically, compared to 14% in 2012, and 11.9% in 2011. Those who believed that media freedom advanced significantly fell to 6.9% from 8.5% the previous year and more significantly from 15.4% in 2011, the year when the Arab Spring started. A large percentage of journalists (31.7%) believed that media freedom remained unchanged.

In the same vein, the rating of the state of media freedom in the eyes of journalists deteriorated. Those who believe that media freedom is in an excellent state did not exceed 3.9%, while tragically 29.7% rated it as low.

Going back to previous years, the best rating of freedom of the media was in 2011, when 4.8% considered it excellent, and 16.8% described it as low. In 2013, 13.9% described it as good, compared with 23.9% of journalists in 2011, and 19.3% in 2012.

In light of these facts, the index of media freedom dropped by an arithmetic average

of 12-points from to 53% in 2011 to 41% in 2013.

The 2012 survey, in which 461 journalists participated, underwent a revision in light of new developments in the media community, but the state of frustration continued to prevail among journalists, 55.7% of whom continue to believe categorically that legislation constitutes a restriction on media freedom, a very close result to that of 2012, which amounted to 55.3%. At the same time, there was a slight improvement in the percentage of those who believe that legislation contributed to the advancement of freedom of the media to 16.3%, compared to 13% the previous year.

It is important to stop before the state of legislation to affirm that the major landmark was the Press and Publications Law, which was enacted in 2012, and became operative in June 2013. The law resulted in blocking 291 websites, created a wide-ranging controversy not confined to the media circles, and it became the main concern. Its repercussions were the most important at the level of freedoms and the legislative environment. Journalists who resisted the Law when it was enacted and protested against it in 2012, continued to refuse it in 2013, though it became a *fait accompli*, especially after the High Court of Justice rejected the lawsuit filed by publishers of websites demanding the Law's annulment.

In all cases, legislation remained a source of concern for journalists in Jordan. The indicator in opinion surveys continued to show that the majority of journalists see it as a restriction on their freedom. Only in 2008,

## Executive Summary

31.4% saw that legislation contributes to supporting media freedom; in subsequent years this ratio did not exceed 18% at best. A sizeable proportion of journalists kept their belief that legislation does not affect the freedom of their media work in the indicator, perhaps because they believed that it is a complex problem that does not stop at laws only.

The position of journalists in Jordan goes beyond the legal framework, to the more important area of the Constitution. Journalists are increasingly convinced that the government is not earnest in implementing constitutional amendments related to media freedom, an outlook shared by 29.9% of journalists, or nearly one-third. Only 5.4% believe that it is very serious about implementing these amendments, 32.3% believe that it is moderately serious and 31.5% slightly serious. All these indicators saw negative change or a retreat.

Twelve years have passed since CDFJ launched the opinion survey, and yet the index of journalists who are convinced that the government interferes in the media continues to rise. The index has risen steadily since 2004, when the level of intervention in journalists' opinion was 59.4%, and in 2013 it reached 84.2%.

The analysis of this question is in itself highly significant. All the talk about media reform has not convinced journalists. Journalists, whether in the private sector or the government media, agree that the government tampers with the media scene.

The continued government intervention is

not the only disturbing indicator. Another indicator is that self-censorship is on the rise again, after it had retreated noticeably in the early days of popular mobilization and protests in 2011, when this indicator dropped to 87%. It went further down to 85.8% in 2012, from 93.5% in 2010, and before that it had reached a terrible record of 95.5% in 2009.

In 2013, the self-censorship index rose to 91.3%. The most logical explanation of this result is that the restrictions imposed by the Press and Publications Law on the electronic media were not limited to journalists; they went further to comments posted by citizens on the news published in news websites. This prompted journalists to exercise self-censorship on the comments, in addition to great caution in writing the news for fear of prosecution.

The Armed Forces remained the organization which journalists avoid criticizing the most (87.6%), followed respectively by the judiciary (83.3%), then surprisingly by tribal sheikhs and notables (76.6%), religious issues (75.7%), security agencies (73.1%), and finally discussion of sex issues (72.9%).

When journalists were asked what were the three most important topics that they avoid, The Armed Forces came in first place by a ratio of 20.8%, followed in second place by security agencies with 14.9%, in a remarkable development from the previous year when it was 12.9%, and in third place came religious issues with the same ratio as last year, 13%.

Remarkably, this year 6.3% of journalists dared to say that they cannot publish any

criticism of the King or the Royal Family or the Palace.

It is known that the Jordanian Constitution stipulates that the King is immune to criticism.

The impression that the decline of the popular movement impacted the state of media freedom is evident in journalists' answers and their points of view on the effect of revolutions and protests on the media landscape.

This question, which was added to the survey in 2011 to explore the dialectic relationship between the media and the popular movement, revealed important indicators, highlighted the state of optimism and rejuvenated hope among journalists in their ability to gain their independence. But, the hands of the clock now move backwards. An arithmetic average of 68.5% believes that popular protests and mobilization increased the margin of media freedom, a decrease from 85.8% in 2011 and 80.9% in 2012. Moreover, the contribution of these protests in effecting the flow of new information to the public also fell to an arithmetic average of 76.9%, from 88.5% in 2011.

More importantly, the media contribution to breaking the red lines dropped to an arithmetic average of 67% in 2013, from 79% in 2011, and 78.6% in 2012.

The role of protests in limiting intervention by the government and security agencies dropped to 56.5% after it had reached 65.5% in 2011, and 60.6% in 2012.

As for the impact of protests on self-censorship by journalists, the arithmetic

average was 62.7% in 2011. It declined sharply to 62.7% in 2013, which was confirmed by the results of the poll on the rise of prior censorship among journalists.

For the second year, the survey explored attitudes and trends among journalists regarding public issues that caught the attention of local public opinion. Numerical indicators showed similarity between the outlooks of journalists and the prevailing popular mood especially over controversial issues. For instance, 84.4 % of journalists do not approve of Parliamentary Deputies using weapons in the House of Representatives and condemn this behavior; similarly, 76.8 % opposed the vote by Parliamentary Deputies to grant themselves pensions and raise these pensions; 69.4 % categorically do not support raising the price of bread, and 67.9 % do not approve the tax on clothes. Noticeably, 60.1 % of journalists are concerned about the repercussions of the Syrian crisis on Jordan.

But, this question led to polarization among journalists over other questions. For instance, regarding their position on the overthrow of Egyptian President Mohamed Morsi, 22.1% supported it strongly, while 21% opposed it categorically. Similarly, 32.5% supported strongly Syria's agreement to surrender its chemical weapons, while 19.1% opposed it categorically.

The 2013 opinion survey underwent a review – which happens annually – to bring it up to date with developments in the media scene in Jordan. Some questions were eliminated because they had become obsolete and answers to them no longer

## Executive Summary

constituted an addition to the survey's content. At the same time, new questions and sections were developed. A special section on hate speech in the media was introduced. Questions asked were not open-ended in order to develop data on the basis of the most important responses received in previous years. Questions related to electronic media, methods of containment of journalists and violations were amended, and questions related to political Islam and media freedom were cancelled.

The survey's methodology adopted a design of the questionnaire form that included 390 questions spread over eight main sections, designed to measure Jordanian journalists' evaluation of media freedom in its different dimensions, measure the extent of journalists' satisfaction with the media legislation and its impact on the state of media freedoms, and identify the problems and pressures that journalists face.

The questionnaire form was offered to a technical committee to judge it and the committee's observations were noted and reflected in the questionnaire. In addition, a trial was conducted to ensure that questions are clear to respondents. All observations that came out of this trial were used to shape the final form of the questionnaire.

The population under study consisted of about 1,540 journalists and media workers. Those eligible to participate were members in the register of the Jordan Press Association (JPA) and the CDFJ until the date of the survey in the period 11<sup>th</sup> November 2013 until 10<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

The design of the study sample is based on the systematic random sampling method, at a 95% confidence level, and with a standard error rate of 3.6%. Journalists were divided into two categories in a manner proportional to the size of each category as follows:

Category I: included journalists and media professionals in the public sector.

Category II: included journalists and media professionals in the private sector.

Also, journalists and media professionals in each category were distributed by sex in a manner also proportional to size. Journalists and media professionals not registered in the JPA were also taken into account; they were distributed in the sample in a manner proportional to size.

It is important to note that the study sample for this year was smaller than previous years, although the number of journalists (both registered in the JPA and outside it) is increasing. This year's study sample consisted of about 461 people working in the media sector, a 9.3% decrease from the 2012 sample, because of difficulties that faced the data collection team.

Journalists and media professionals not registered in the JPA were also taken into account; they were distributed in the sample in a manner proportional to size. The percentage of journalists and media professionals enrolled in the JPA was 58.2% while those not enrolled in the JPA was 41.8 %.

The percentage of journalists who responded to the poll was 92.2% while the percentage of non-response was 7.8%,

and partial responses to the questions in the questionnaire form were 4.6%. The percentage of journalists who refused to respond to all survey questions was 3.2%.

Returning to the results of the poll, the amendment to the Press and Publications Law captured much attention in 2013, specifically its effect on the electronic media. In this context, 44.5% of journalists consider the licensing requirement imposed on websites in the Press and Publications Law as a restriction on freedom of the media, 27.5% see it as supportive of media freedom, and 27.5% believe that it does not affect media freedom.

The percentage of journalists who believed that blocking unlicensed websites according to the provisions of the Press and Publication Law is a restriction on media freedom rose to 49.5%, while 23.4% saw that it enhances media freedom, and 26.9% believed that it does not affect media freedom.

Even blocking websites by means of a judicial decision was opposed by 49%, who considered it a restriction on freedom. The percentage of opponents increased where it pertains to considering comments posted on websites as part of the journalistic material; 51.6% considered this legal provision as a restriction on freedom, 24.9% considered that it enhances media freedom and 22.1% considered that it has no effect.

With regard to the impact of the requirement to license websites on the state of professionalism, and its effectiveness in limiting negative phenomena of which electronic media were accused and

which the Law sought to rectify, such as extortion/ blackmail, the rise in crimes of defamation, compliance with balance objectivity, and credibility, and recourse to slander, the answers of journalists did not show significant progress achieved by the amendment to the Press and Publication Law in addressing these phenomena.

A review of the indicators shows that 52.3% believe that the level of professionalism in the electronic media remained unchanged after licensing; while 26.7% said that there has been improvement in this direction, while 20.2% saw that there is decline in the degree of professionalism.

With regard to reducing extortion/ blackmail, 42.5% believe that the situation remained unchanged; only 21.5% believe that there is an increase in this phenomenon while 27.5% believe that there was a decrease in extortion/ blackmail.

The decrease in crimes of libel may be the most important indicator in the opinion of journalists because 47.1% said that the law has achieved this. The same applies to crimes of defamation since 35.4% believe that the law will succeed in reducing them, while 40.6% believe that they have remained unchanged.

There was no radical change in compliance with balance, objectivity, credibility and bias. Journalists believe that they remained unchanged, respectively by a percentage of 52.5%, 48.2%, and 56.2% respectively.

On close scrutiny, journalists believe that the Law played a role in limiting practices that are considered violations of the law on issues such as libel and defamation, but it did not achieve its objectives in the areas

## Executive Summary

of the degree of professionalism and codes of conduct.

It may be important to point out that cases received by Media Legal Aid Unit (MELAD) to litigate in cases filed against journalists, particularly websites have increased after enactment of the Law, which suggests that prosecution has increased, but compliance with the law and fear of it have, at least, not manifested themselves.

All efforts at fighting corruption and all the talk about reforming the media appear not to have borne fruit in reducing the containment of reporters, a phenomenon that appears to be increasing instead of decreasing. By the words of journalists themselves, 21.5% acknowledged that they were subjected to attempts at containment, inducement, and [offers of] privileges in course of their journalistic work. A higher percentage, 50.1%, acknowledged that they heard of colleagues who were subjected to attempts at containment. Upon adding those who were subjected directly to attempts at containment and those who heard that others were subjected to such attempts, the percentage becomes 71.6 %, which indicates that the government and other parties continue to penetrate the community of journalists. On the other hand, there appeared to be a crisis regarding the Code of Ethics that governs the work of journalists and a lack of controls and codes of professional conduct for media organizations to regulate these phenomena.

The government and its institutions kept the lead in attempts to give privileges to journalists, at 27.1%, plus quasi-governmental organizations at 4.8%, which

brings the total to 31.9%. They are followed by businessmen at 28.9%, commercial enterprises and advertising companies at 16.9%, then security agencies and civil society organizations at 5.4%, followed by political parties at 4.2%.

Financial donations and gifts remained the most common forms of containment, at 44.3%, followed by facilitation of services and procedures by official institutions (20.7%), then appointment to a governmental or quasi-government position (20%), then receiving exemptions from customs or receiving free medical treatment or education (5 %), and invitations to travel abroad (4.3%).

Most importantly, 23.2% of journalists who were subjected to attempts at containment have started to feel that attempts at containment influence their attitudes and their professional work, compared with 16.7% in 2012.

Attempts at containment have established the belief among an arithmetic average of 61% of journalists that the government resorts to this method in order to gain their loyalty.

A new aspect of the 2013 poll is that it sought diligently to discover where corruption is spread in the media, such as favoritism, bribery, paid news and features, extortion for material gains, acceptance of gifts, and acceptance of conflicts of interests by journalists or turning a blind eye to the phenomenon.

The media were divided into the following sectors: official media (Jordan Radio and Television (JRTV) and the Jordan News Agency (Petra)), daily newspapers, weekly



newspapers, news websites, and private radio and television stations.

Numeric indicators revealed that certain forms of corruption are more widespread in certain media sectors than others, and that other forms are more common in other sectors. This changes the order.

With regard to the spread of favoritism in the media, the official media took the first place by a mean of 81.8%, followed by daily newspapers at 76.7%, then news websites at 71.8%, private radio and television stations at 71.5%, and finally weekly newspapers at 65.5%.

When studying bribery and its spread among the media, news websites were the most frequently accused at a rate of 70.3%, followed by private radio and television stations at 64.3%, then weekly newspapers at 60.5%, daily newspapers at 55.9%, and finally the official media (JRTV and Petra) at 51.8%.

With regard to the practice of extortion for material gains, news websites were also the most frequently accused, at a mean of 71.9%, followed by private radio and television stations at 64.9%, with weekly newspapers at the same rate of 64.9%, then daily newspapers at 51.9%, and JRTV and Petra at 47.4%.

In the area of writing paid news and features, news websites were also accused of practicing this most widely at 79.3%, followed by private radio and television stations at 72.9%, then weekly newspapers at 69.7% and the official media (JRTV and Petra) at 53.8%.

It is important to note that many private

and semi-public organizations now ask the media to write news and features about them in return for contracts of financial patronage.

Finally, news websites remained in the forefront in being accused of accepting gifts, at an arithmetic mean of 76%, followed by private radio and television stations at 71.8%, then weekly newspapers at 69%, daily newspapers at 63.8%, and the official media at 60.8%.

A review of the figures shows that this phenomenon is prevalent among the different media. Journalists do not deal with it as something that affects their independence and there are no limitations on gifts that can be accepted and that constitute a symbolic recognition of journalists.

The same applies to attitudes towards conflicts of interests. It is a widespread practice that does not cause embarrassment to a journalist who works for an organization and covers its news. It would appear that the Code of Conduct approved by the Cabinet of Samir Rifai more than three years ago has expired.

Going back to the figures on the prevalence of this phenomenon, it transpires that the arithmetic mean for news websites amounted to 73.7%, for private radio and television stations 69.2%, weekly newspapers 68.1%, daily newspapers, 62.2%, and finally for official media 59%.

Most disastrously, despite the prevalence of corruption in its various manifestations in media circles, some acknowledge it while others do not see these practices as corruption, but as rightful financial gains

## Executive Summary

for journalists and media organizations. Out of the journalists who participated in the survey, 89% of respondents were convinced that these negative phenomena affect media freedom, which shows contradiction between the concepts and values on the one hand, and practices on the ground on the other.

The different forms of violations against journalists have not stopped since the start of the preparation of this report. The survey tries to expose hidden violations that were not disclosed by journalists within the extensive sample that it combines, but the fundamental tool for detecting violations is the 'Ain' Program for Monitoring and Documentation of Violations against Media Freedoms and the Network for Media Freedom Defenders in the Arab World (SANAD), which operates in a number of Arab countries.

The index of arrests of journalists was back on the rise, to 1.7% in 2013 after it had decreased to 0.6% in 2011 and 1.2% in 2012.

According to journalists, 62.5% of arrest warrants were mostly issued by the civil Prosecutor General, 37.5% by the court, and finally 25% by the Prosecutor General of the State Security Court.

It is worth noting that there were eight arrests in 2013, but lawsuits against journalists increased in number to 6.7% in 2013, compared with 5.1% in 2012.

In the context of violations, 34.1% of participating journalists said that they were subjected to pressure and harassment in course of doing their journalistic work, compared with 36.2% in 2012. Withholding

information remained the most important violation of which journalists complained (23.4% ), followed by threats (8.7%), slander (6.7%), blocking websites (6.5%), summons by security agencies ( 6.5%), prevention of coverage (3%), destruction or confiscation journalists' tools (1.7%), investigation by security agencies (1.5%), and prevention from broadcasting on TV or via satellite (1.1%).

It is also noteworthy that journalists are more likely to document gross violations such as arrest, beating, and blocking websites; but there is a bigger problem with failing to document the most frequent violation, which is withholding information. Journalists do not file complaints with the Information Council (IC) or take legal action to limit this phenomenon.

Violations, depending on their type, are committed by different actors. Withholding information, for instance is done by ministers and other government officials (42.3%), followed by security agencies (19.8%).

Libel and slander, in 24.2% of cases is done by ordinary citizens, and 15.2% by ministers and other government officials.

As for threats, 17.5% of cases were committed by ordinary citizens, 12.5% by influential persons and advertising agencies, and surprisingly 10% were committed by journalists.

In cases of detention/ incarceration the perpetrators in 66.7% of cases were security services, and in 33.3% of cases government officials. Of course, 100% of cases of summons by security agencies were carried out by security agencies, and the

same applies to security investigations.

The most problematic issues that imposed itself on the media in Jordan and the Arab world as a consequence of the revolutions and protest movements is the spread of hate speech and incitement in the media. Accordingly, the survey sought to study this phenomenon numerically in the context as a study appended to the Media Freedom Status in Jordan report this year.

The most prominent indicator is that the revolutions and protest movements contributed to enhancing the discourse of violence and exclusion of the other by arithmetic mean of 61%. The Syrian media was the most effective in boosting hate speech by an index of nearly 7.7 points out of 10, followed by the Egyptian media by about 7.6 points, then the Tunisian media by 5.9 points. The least conducive to hate speech were the Jordanian media with 4.3 points.

Conversely, the Jordanian media did the most in calling for tolerance, with an index of 6.4 points out of 10, followed by Tunisia with 4.9, Egypt with 3.4, and Syria came in last place with 3.4.

For more information, read details of the study in the Report.

## Second: Complaints and Violations

A striking result of monitoring and documenting violations against the media in Jordan is the evident decrease in grievous violations that were widespread and systematic in Jordan particularly in 2011, with the start of revolutions and popular movements that swept the Arab world. Ain

believes that the logical explanation of the decrease in this type of violations, which was not common in Jordan in the previous decades, was the decline of demonstrations and protests in the Jordanian street. Fewer demonstrations meant that journalists were less frequently present in hot areas of tension and friction, which made them vulnerable to deliberate and systematic as well as accidental attacks.

However, violations in general did not decrease. Withholding information and interventions continue to take place. The most prominent violation was the enactment by the government of the Press and Publications Law, which caused 291 websites to be blocked. This was a broad collective violation, contrary to the standards of media freedom and freedom of the Internet. Despite government pledges after the enactment of the Press and Publications Law to limit trials of journalists to cases based on the Press and Publications Law, journalists were detained and referred to the State Security Court.

The issue that preoccupied journalists most was job security, after the Arabic daily newspaper Alarab Alyawm closed and terminated the services of most of its staff whose number was more than 200 journalists and employees. This decision was followed by a long protest in front of the newspaper by its employees against non-payment of their salaries and financial entitlements.

The crisis of Alarab Alyawm had hardly faded from the scene when employees of Arabic daily newspaper Alrai erected their tent protesting against the refusal of the newspaper's management to comply

# Executive Summary

with a labor agreement signed by them in 2011. The protest at Alrai escalated to demands for the dismissal of the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors, and journalists stopped publishing any news related to the Prime Minister and members of the Council of Ministers. The crisis deepened when employees decided to stop publication of the newspaper for one day, which was considered the most dangerous indicator of the print media's crisis. This prompted parliamentary deputies and public figures to intervene to contain the crisis, which did not stop until the Board of Directors was dismissed and the government pledged to implement the labor agreement. In the meantime, the crisis at Arabic daily newspaper Addustour was open to all possibilities because of the deteriorating financial position of the newspaper and the failure to pay employees' salaries on time.

## Complaints in Jordan

The state of media freedoms in Jordan in 2013 was marked by a severe reversal. The government besieged the media, especially the electronic media, by enacting the amendments to the Press and Publications Law, which led to the closure of a large number of them. The government also continued to dominate the official media. There were several cases where journalists were referred to the courts, particularly to the State Security Court for trial on the basis of the Penal Code for material they published in the media. Despite the significant and clear decline in the state of media freedom in Jordan, the number of cases that Ain monitored and the number of complaint, reporting, and monitoring

forms received and filled by the monitors were close to the previous year for reasons that are detailed in the Report.

The Ain' Program for Monitoring and Documentation of Violations against Media Freedoms, which is part of the Network for Media Freedom Defenders in the Arab World (SANAD), managed to verify the occurrence of a number of violations of journalists' rights and media freedoms in Jordan in 2013. Ain gathered this information from cases which it monitored either through information forms (complaints or reports) or by direct monitoring. All these cases were subjected to study, verification of the facts, and a scientific and legal review. Out of 100 information forms received by Ain in 2013, 61 involved one or more violations of media freedoms or the rights of journalists. Below is a table showing the number of forms received by Ain and, their type, and the number of violations to which they pertain, bearing in mind that there are many cases in which Ain found one form related to more than one violation of human rights or media freedoms:

Form type	Total number	No. of violations	Percentage
Complaint	81	52	85.2%
Report	1	1	1.6%
Direct monitoring	18	8	13%
Total	100	61	100%

## Diversity and wide scope of the problems involved in the cases

As in the year 2012, complaints and reports received by Ain on violations of media freedoms in Jordan did not focus

on specific violations or problems. They included a variety of subjects. The following table shows the different violations which people who submitted the complaints or reports claimed to have taken place against journalists or the media, or which Ain monitored directly:

Subject	Number	%
Blocking of news websites	291	72%
Preventing coverage	42	10.4%
Harassment	12	3.4%
Threats	14	2.9%
Verbal abuse	8	1.9%
Pressure to remove or alter the content of a news item	6	1.4%
Arbitrary use of authority in granting a license	5	1.2%
Withholding information	5	1.2%
Confiscation of tools of the trade	3	0.7%
Summons for a security investigation	3	0.7%
Financial harm	3	0.7%
imprisonment	2	0.5%
Detention	2	0.5%
Gender inequality and discrimination	2	0.5%
Prior censorship	2	0.5%
Post facto censorship of news	2	0.5%
Suspension from work	1	0.2%
Total	403	100%

It is noticeable in the table above that the types of problems and violations cited in the forms are more than the number of forms. This is normal because some forms cited more than one type of violations; for instance, the plaintiff journalist may have been beaten and prevented from covering a story at the same time.

## The state of complaints and violations in Jordan

As a result of the study and analysis of the cases monitored by Ain, it transpired that there are a number of general trends similar in part to trends revealed last year, in addition to new trends that emerged in 2013. These general trends can be summarized as follows:

- A clear return by journalists to the practice of not reporting violations.
- Erosion of job security for journalists and its impact on the practice of media freedoms.
- A retreat in the role of print media to the benefit of electronic media.
- A preference among journalists for conciliatory solutions instead of legal solutions.
- Diversity and widening scope of the problems involved in the cases.
- Lack of knowledge of the legal and legislative systems related to media freedom.

## Listing and analysis of sample cases

The report lists the most [prominent cases

# Executive Summary

and complaints received by Ain in 2013 with regard to problems faced by Jordanian journalists. This list focuses on cases that raised questions which merit analysis and discussion. They are:

- ✓ The case of Eyad Jaghbeer who had criminal charges filed against him.
- ✓ The case of Hassan Al Hussein who was beaten by a candidate for parliamentary election.
- ✓ The complaint of Yousef Bustanji of Ro'ya TV channel for being beaten by the Drug Control Unit.
- ✓ The complaint of Adnan Bariyeh concerning his arbitrary dismissal from work at Alarab Alyawm Arabic daily newspaper.
- ✓ The complaint of Hadeel Ghabboun regarding delays in accrediting her as a reporter for the Arabic website of CNN.
- ✓ The complaint of Rashid Furaihat that he was beaten by the Darak (gendarmes) at the Chamber of Deputies (Lower House of Parliament).
- ✓ The complaint of Ahmad Abu Hamad that he was prevented from covering a protest by the staff of the Palace of Justice (Court).
- ✓ The complaint of Walid Hosni that he was prevented from entering the Occupied Palestinian Territories.
- ✓ The complaint Omar Zyoud that he received a telephone call instructing him to remove a news item.
- ✓ The complaint by a group of

journalists that the police stormed the offices of Alrai Arabic daily newspaper.

- ✓ The trial of Nidal Faraaneh and Amjad Maalla before the State Security Court.

## Underlying political trends revealed by the violations of media freedoms and the rights of journalists: general panorama

The year 2013 was characterized by a major decline in media freedoms in Jordan, despite the significant decrease in the number of grievous violations compared to last year. This kind of violation decreased in Jordan in favor of other violations such as preventing coverage, detention of journalists, and trial of journalists before the State Security Court, which does not provide guarantees of a fair trial, particularly the independence of the court itself. Jordan has continued to pursue a policy of using the law as a tool for suppressing freedoms and muzzling and narrowing the freedom of the media. It has also continued the policy of impunity and hiding the identity of violators. In general, it can be said that official and government control of media has increased. It was manifested in the severe tightening of the freedom of electronic media and amendments to the laws governing the work of media in ways that flagrantly devastates its freedom.

Violations against media freedoms and the rights of journalists in Jordan in 2013 were distributed over more than one of the rights monitored by Ain, particularly since violations against human rights, including freedom of the media tend to

be multi-faceted by virtue of their nature and the interdependence between them. Violations which the Unit verified as having occurred in Jordan included: abuse; cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment; freedom of expression, publication, and media; illegal detention; assault on the personal freedom of journalists; and trial before special courts that do not provide internationally recognized guarantees of a fair trial.

The table below details the rights and freedoms that were violated and their numbers:

Right violated	Number	%
Freedom of expression, publication, and media	334	%86.9
The right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment	19	%4.9
The right of access to information	12	%3
Personal freedom and personal security	6	%1.5
The sanctity of private property	5	%1.3
The right to a fair trial	4	%1
Illegal detention	4	%1
Total	384	100%

The report addresses the above issues as follows:

- Decline in media freedoms.
- Decrease in the number of grievous violations.

- Continuation of the policy of impunity and lack of accountability of the culprits.
- Trial of journalists before the State Security Court.
- Frequent cases of preventing coverage by security agencies.
- The return to self-censorship among journalists.

### Main violations against media freedoms and the rights of journalists

These violations include those that occurred and violated media freedoms and the rights of journalists as a result of certain acts and practices (violations resulting from practices) and as a result of the operative legislation and laws in force. It is important to stress that these violations contravened more than one of the recognized human rights and media freedoms, but they were classified in the report according to their most visible form; i.e. these violations were classified according to their most visible form although they may involve violations of other rights or freedoms. They can be summarized as follows:

### Violations related to the threat of attack on the right to life

Ain did not monitor in 2013 any attacks on media freedom through violation of the journalists' right to life or the threat of being deprived of it. It can be said in general that this kind of violation is not common in Jordan

# Executive Summary

- Violations related to the right not to be subjected to torture or other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

In 2013, Ain monitored and documented a number of violations related to maltreatment of journalists in different ways, including arbitrary or illegal deprivation of freedom, verbal abuse, beating, threats, and summons by security agencies because of journalistic work. The unit was able to verify the occurrence of violations of this type in 19 cases monitored. Below is a list of the most important:

- ✓ Attack on AbdulHamid Al-Lahham of Radio Al-Balad who was beaten by masked supporters of a candidate for parliamentary elections.
- ✓ Beating of Hassan Khraisat of Efra news.
- ✓ Threats made against Amjad Majali of Alrai Arabic daily newspaper and subjecting him to verbal abuse using foul language.
- ✓ Beating of Ghassan Abu Louz and the team of Al Arabiya satellite television station at Al Zaatari Camp (for Syrian refugees).
- ✓ Beating of Ahmad Harasis of the online news website Jo24, by the Darak (gendarmes).

## violations of the right to a fair trial

It was pointed out earlier that 2013 saw the trial of a number of Jordanian journalists before the State Security Court for activities and material

that comes under the exercise of freedom of the media. Ain monitored four violations of media freedom by subjecting journalists to trials before the State Security Court, in violation of the right to a fair trial stipulated in Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Below is a list of a number of these violations:

- ✓ Maher Madieh was summoned by the Prosecutor General of the State Security Court.
- ✓ Nader Maqableh was summoned by the Prosecutor General of the State Security Court for publishing a story about changing the Chief of Staff.
- ✓ Nidal Faraaneh and Amjad Maalla were tried before the State Security Court.

## Grievous violations of the right to personal freedom

Ain monitored and documented six violations in 2013 that affected the personal freedom of Jordanian journalists by detaining or arresting them. Below is a list of the most important cases:

- ✓ Detention of Samer AL Shammari at the Mafraq Police Directorate.
- ✓ Detention of Nidal Salameh when he appeared before the Prosecutor General of the State Security Court.
- ✓ Detention of Issa Shaqfeh without a legal cause by the anti-narcotics police while he was going about his work.



- Grievous violations of the freedom of expression, publication and the media

Ain verified in 2013 the occurrence of 384 violations of the freedom of opinion, expression and publication through actions that do not involve the denial of other recognized human rights. Below is a list of the most important

- ✓ Prevention of Jihad Ghaben from taking photographs during the election campaign by the Public Security Directorate Special Branch.
- ✓ Harassment of Hadeel Dasouqi and forcing her to withdraw a news item after it had been published
- ✓ Withholding information from Muwaffaq Kamal by the Secretary General of the Ministry of Justice.
- ✓ Preventing a number of journalists from asking questions and getting information in a meeting of the Initiative 'For Greater Irbid.'
- ✓ Preventing a number of journalists from covering a meeting of the Minister of Social Development.
- ✓ Attempting to close Yarmouk TV and preventing it from broadcasting.
- ✓ Blocking hundreds of websites in accordance with the Jordanian Amended Press and Publications Law.

### Third: Researches and Studies

The purpose of the study, "I Hate You..."

the Hate Speech and Sectarianism in the Media of the Arab Spring" is to explore the form and content of the hate speech, sectarian incitement, and discrimination in the media of the Arab Spring, and measure the extent of these media's commitment to international and professional standards, and the extent of their involvement in the political and sectarian conflicts in the countries of the Arab Spring.

The study found that hate speech in the media of the Arab Spring was not incidental or improvised. It simply became more prominent and pressing in the period of revolutions and popular protests and its aftermath. It shifted from being a potential or latent discourse to one that is very visible, pressing, and very dangerous. It is also no longer limited to countries that had revolutions and conflicts with the local regime; it has swept through all Arab countries; it spread and ramified widely and became a dangerous tool for incitement against the other. This discourse appears to be the principal mover of Arab politicians and the public, particularly in Arab states that passed through a transition from the old to the new regimes and have not yet achieved real stability, Egypt, Tunisia, and Yemen.

The study affirmed that sectarian discourse was employed by existing regimes against popular protests, describing them as sectarian and confessional protests in order to isolate and deface them and deprive them of popular support, as in Bahrain, for instance. Hate speech has become stronger in facing the other in order to exclude and alienate him, as in Egypt and Syria.

## Executive Summary

In all the scenes of the Arab Spring the real confrontation that used hate speech the most seemed to be between Islamists on one side, and secularists and liberals on the other. Both sides sought to mobilize the media in this confrontation, which was not without violence and loss of life. The study also affirmed that the entry of Islamic jihadist organizations into the battlefield against existing regimes has strongly reinforced hate speech and sectarianism. In the case of Syria, it was the entry of Islamic fundamentalist jihadist organizations that threw the door wide open to inflame sectarian conflicts in the region and in the Arab media.

The study found that the conversion of the conflict in Egypt, Tunisia and Yemen from a conflict with the previous regimes to a conflict with the Islamists enhanced hate speech and sectarian discourses. The conflict became one between the religious and non-religious, in which Arab media did not pass the test of neutrality, but found themselves siding up with parties to the conflict. The media were no longer neutral, impartial and honest observers; they were immersed in the clashes and conflicts and they became part of these conflicts through polarization of information, propaganda and politics. The media came to use the same language as the antagonists and they drowned in hate speech, incitement, agitation of sectarianism, killing, and exclusion of the other in order to prevail against him, as in Egypt, Syria, Tunisia, Libya, Yemen, and Bahrain.

The study said that many countries have helped to nurture hate speech and sectarianism. Political conflict between states moved to the squares of local war

and confrontation in the Arab Spring states. In the case of the Syria, Egypt, Yemen and Bahrain these countries remained the main nurturers of those conflicts and of the media discourse that serves these policies. This became very clear in the support of the Arab Gulf states for the political and media conflict in Egypt, Saudi Arabia's support of the sectarian conflict in Syria and Yemen, Iran's interference in the Syrian crisis with its military arm Hezbollah, and pushing thousands of volunteers from all parts of the world to fight in Syria with joint support from Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran, the United States, Jordan... etc. This transformed the Syrian revolution to a strange mosaic of sectarian conflict, which led to division of the Arab street and turned Arab media to a tool of pressure, mobilization and incitement.

The study believes that some media played a noticeable and major biased inflammatory role in the Arab Spring revolutions. Certain Arab satellite channels appeared clearly to put all their capabilities at the service of one party at the expense of another. Al Jazeera, for instance, supported with clear bias ousted Egyptian president Mohamed Morsi, while Al Arabiya sided with the leader of the military coup Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, but they both stopped supporting the Syrian revolution, which was left to the Syrian media to nurture in their own way.

The study posits that, despite the existence of international conventions and standards to limit hate speech and sectarian and discriminatory discourse, and although most Arab states are signatory to these conventions, yet they have all remained inactive for the benefit of the opposite discourse of hate, discrimination, and

sectarianism. With the exception of simple experiments to monitor hate speech in the media, censorship on media content that adopts the discourse of hate, discrimination, and sectarianism is still modest, and in many Arab countries such positive censorship which is required, remains completely absent. The experience of Egypt, Tunis, Yemen and even Lebanon in this area looked distinctly good, but it needs to be consolidated and universalized, especially by civil society organizations specialized in monitoring hate speech in the local media for each country separately, in order to expose, fight, limit and treat this discourse. This would be done to promote the principle that the public has a human right to know media outlets that depend on disseminating discourse of hate, sectarian and religious incitement, and discrimination among people on the basis of religion, race, creed, color, or sex.

This study looked with appreciation at Arab attempts to reject and renounce hate speech and sectarianism in their communities. Bahrain's attempt, for instance, to develop a document renouncing hatred, constitutes a popular experiment of the highest importance. The same is true of the draft statement rejecting hatred in Kuwait. These are the only two Arab states that have attempted such an experiment. The same is true of Jordan, which launched the Amman Message at a very early stage, and which worked to promote the values of Islamic tolerance and rejecting sectarianism which reached the point of declaring the other as an apostate.

The study showed that tolerance in the Arab world, especially after the Arab

Spring, reached its lowest point. There is no longer any room for tolerance between antagonists, which calls for reconsidering all the political, intellectual and programmatic output that comes from them. Such output should be exposed, categorized and disseminated so the public can be aware of these media and on its guard. The process of incitement and pouring accusations and insults as do the media that are biased to a party to the conflict or another, has begun to affect the public negatively. In Egypt and Syria, the media have indulged in open incitement, which nurtured the conflict to the point of spreading violence and terror.

The study showed that the Arab world has entered into a phase of political and sectarian polarization, in which the media played a direct role. The study pointed out that this phase will impose itself on the Arab world, media, and society for an indeterminate period in the future, and it will have many dangerous political, intellectual, social, and media outcomes, which will be difficult to redress. What is happening in Syria and Egypt, for example, has flung the peoples of these two countries into a state of internal conflict, some of which is personal vengeance to the extreme, and some religious/ sectarian also to the extreme. This will subsequently enhance the spirit of revenge among members of society. The media, therefore, has the difficult task of promoting tolerance and coexistence among all segments and sects of society.

The study showed that the media contributed immensely to creating a hostile environment for refugees from Syria, and even Palestinians. This was done

## Executive Summary

by the media in Egypt, Lebanon, and even Jordan. The media spread hatred towards Syrian refugees who escaped the bloody conflict in their country, describing them as criminals, beggars, greedy merchants, spies...etc.

According to the study, the media have also reinforced discrimination against women. In the Egyptian media, women have become the subject of violation and hatred (sexual harassment, for example, in Egypt). The Egyptian media occupied themselves with this issue to a dramatic extent and strengthened it, piling accusations against women in the squares of protest. In Jordan, discriminatory discourse against women was clear in the rejection of women's human and constitutional right to grant nationality to their children from a foreign husband. A direct discriminatory discourse was used under the pretext of political fears, which were linked to the national identity of Jordan and the fear of demographic change, which would negatively affect the identity of the pure Jordanian society.

The study affirmed that spreading hate speech and sectarianism in the media of the Arab Spring is a direct violation of the international human rights system, which calls for legal accountability on the local and international levels.

The study stressed that the culture of hatred and inciting sectarianism are merely ideas conceived by humans that were attached to religion as if they were part of it. This requires exposing these ideas, refuting them, and presenting them to the public in school and even university syllabuses, explaining that killing on the basis of one's sect, color, race or gender is not part of the

teachings of Islam or Christianity, but the ideas of individuals who found thousands of people willing to follow their ideas and implement them. The study recommended working from an early stage, from the first years at school, to promote the culture of tolerance, co-existence, and renouncing hatred, violence and sectarianism as acts that bear no relation to religion. It also recommended that the media join forces by allocating air time and print space for promoting the culture of dialogue, tolerance and coexistence with the other.

It called for strengthening the role of mosques in promoting a culture of tolerance, coexistence and the ethics of [respecting] difference as an integral part of the great message of Islam and of Islamic values. This would mean restoring the true role of the mosque, which turned recently into a platform for inciting sectarianism and promoting the culture of hatred.

The study recommended the enactment of more stringent laws and regulations against anyone who adopts or promotes a culture of hatred or incitement to sectarianism and discrimination. It also advocated that civil society organizations should work strictly, scientifically, and methodically to expose any media or person who adopts hate speech or incites to sectarian and religious discrimination, and to publish the results of this work in order to make the advocates of hate and sectarianism reconsider and retreat, especially if they are referred to justice or held accountable before society and the media.

The study establishing legal networks to provide free legal counsel and support to victims of hate speech, sectarianism

and discrimination, and that specialized organizations should monitor legislation related to freedom of expression, to differentiate between freedom of expression on the one hand and hate speech or incitement and discrimination on the other.

The study also advocated working to promote the culture of human rights among the public from an early age, and considering human rights as a basic educational material at all stages of education. It recommended training journalists in the system of human rights, especially the parts related to distinguishing between free speech and hate speech. It called for adoption of the Camden Principles on Freedom of Expression and Equality about hate speech in laws related to the Press and Publications Law and freedom of expression.

It called for working to transform the state to a civil state based on the principle of justice for all members of society and equality of opportunities because that would narrow the margin of internal conflicts between members of society who are all governed by the principles and values of social justice. It also called for a social initiative of all activists in all fields to draft and adopt a national document to renounce violence, hatred, sectarianism, and all forms of discrimination.

The study includes seven chapters: the first chapter looks at the concepts involved in hate speech from international law to local laws, and stops before those that oppose hate speech and incitement in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil

and Political Rights.

The second chapter, entitled *The Criminalization of Hate Speech, Boundaries between Freedom of Expression and Hate Speech*, analyzes the definition of hate speech, its manifestations, and the difference between it and freedom of expression.

The study discussed ways to counter hate speech in international law related to human rights, which did not omit to address hate speech and incitement to discrimination, and the exclusion of the other. The study noted that the boundaries of hate speech overlap in one way or another with the right to freedom of expression, which presents a dilemma in determining where freedom of expression begins and where it ends, when expression turns to hate speech, and why international law accords to the state to enact laws in very limited cases, to define limits for freedom of expression.

It discussed at length the Rabat Plan, which was developed originally to counter hate speech and discrimination, and which is still considered one of the best strategies for international action in fighting hate speech. It also discussed extensively the Camden Principles on Freedom of Expression and Equality in greater detail, as well as the Joint Declaration on the Defamation of Religions and Anti-Terrorism and Anti-Extremism Legislation.

In the third chapter, entitled "Why do They Hate Us... the Roots of the Hate Speech between East and West," the study argues that Arab culture did not develop a hate speech such as that generated by political conflicts between Arabs and the West

## Executive Summary

throughout the twentieth century. Arab hatred of the West did not materialize clearly and effectively except when the United States and the West in general sided with the Israeli occupation, refusing to support the Palestinian people in their just cause against Israeli occupation. Then, Washington DC suffered the September attack and led the world in its war against Afghanistan and Iraq, in addition to the media revolution in its successive waves, which opened the doors to the hate speech that we see and suffer from its consequences.

The fourth chapter of the study discusses Political Islam, Hate Speech, Denial of the other and Incitement Against Him. It affirms that the religious discourse of Islamic movements and the political discourse of official Arab regimes have been a fertile incubator that nurtured hate speech in the past few years, especially after the years of the Arab Spring. This fact, unfortunately, appeared to be more than a living reality.

The study concludes this chapter by asserting that hate speech in all its forms and painful and catastrophic manifestations will not fade until all political movements in all their mosaic of politics and ideologies, including political Islamist groups, believe in democracy and the civil state where all citizens are equal in their rights and duties, without discrimination based on religion, sect, ethnicity, or doctrine. The modern civil state is based on all these principles, and when they are applied there will be no place for hate speech or incitement to hatred, which inevitably leads to internal conflict may that would be in its simplest form a devastating civil war.

The study discusses in the fifth chapter reports that monitored hate speech in the media of Arab Spring countries. The chapter starts by analyzing the means and mechanisms of identifying hate speech and distinguishing it from the freedom of expression by applying the six-part test that was adopted in the Rabat Plan of Action and by Article 19, which gives consideration to the broader societal context of the publication; the author or publisher who controls the means of disseminating it to the audience; the intent of the speaker; the content of the publication; the publication's size, general nature, and likelihood of spreading it; the imminence of the advocated action occurring.

The study analyzes in this chapter hate speech on the internet and social media networks, stressing that the open space of the electronic media on the Internet and free social networks open the door wide before unjust and unlimited dissemination of material and discourse containing direct hatred and incitement to terrorism, discrimination and sectarian agitation.

The study dedicated the sixth chapter to analyzing the survey on the impact of revolutions and protest movements in promoting hate speech in the media. The survey aimed to identify the views of the target sample regarding hate speech in the media of Egypt, Syria, Tunisia, and Jordan; their assessment of this speech, its causes and motives; the impact of internal conflicts and popular movements in Arab Spring countries; and whether Arab revolutions contributed positively or negatively to promoting hate speech based on these conflicts.

The answers of the respondent sample of Jordanian journalists showed confusion in understanding hate speech. Cases of confusion were repeated in regard to the concepts of hate speech; tolerance, violence, freedom of expression, the role of the Arab Spring, and the role of the media in carrying these concepts and promoting them in Arab societies in the period after the Arab Spring. The respondent sample believes that the revolutions and protests reinforced tolerance discourse (15.6%), but 23.4% of the same sample believe that they strengthened significantly the discourse of violence and 18.2% felt that they enhanced respect for the opposite opinion and the other's freedom expression.

These confused concepts are the same that are repeated in the sample which felt that the revolutions and protests enhanced tolerance discourse moderately (46.6%), while the same sample considered that revolutions and protests reinforced respect for the opinions of others moderately, at a rate of 50.5%, while 45.8% answered that they fueled discourses of violence and the exclusion of the other.

Noticeably, the sample which responded that revolutions enhanced tolerance discourse (17.6%) dropped about 6 degrees when it answered that the revolutions and protests reinforced respect for the opposite opinion (11.3%), the same approximate percentage that answered with respect to the contribution of revolutions and protests in nurturing hate speech (11%).

The data suggest that revolutions and popular protests have strengthened the discourse of violence while also promoting discourses of tolerance and respect for

the opinions of others, and by very close proportions. This means that the society of revolutions and Arab protests continues to dwell under the influence of internal transformations, and the results have not yet been resolved themselves in the direction of tolerance and freedom of expression, because there is a concurrent rise in the discourse of violence and exclusion of the other.

The poll is the first of its kind in Jordan. It contributed immensely to detecting the level of awareness of the respondent sample of hate speech and sectarianism in the media. At the same time that Jordan ranked lowest in terms of the presence of hate speech in the media, the answers of the same sample acknowledged the existence of such a discourse rather than deny it completely. These results constitute evidence of what could be construed to be an indicator of what the Jordanian media may become later.

Chapter seven, the final chapter, studies hate speech in the Jordanian media, and the nexus between religious tolerance and hatred. The chapter studies the concept and content of hate speech in the Jordanian legislation and concludes that Jordanian legislation does not use explicitly the term "hate" in its multiplicity of texts. Instead, it uses terms and descriptions which constitute, in their essence, part of the elements of hate speech, such as incitement, degradation, inequality and other descriptions connected to hate speech.

The indications contained in Jordanian legislation, such as incitement to violence, discrimination, denigration of

## Executive Summary

Deity, religions, religious communities, and components of Jordanian society, maligning national unity, and discrimination against women, children, and people with disabilities and special needs, sectarian strife... etc. all combined or individually form an integral part of the hate speech. Therefore the legislative and legal grounds are there for criminalizing and punishing any speech that incites to hatred in Jordanian media, and they are largely compatible with Camden Principles, and the six-part test for hate speech established by Article 19, as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), *inter alia*.

The study stopped at length before the report by the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief in the Human Rights Council of the General Assembly of the United Nations Heiner Bielefeld, after his field visit to Jordan in the period 2<sup>nd</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> September 2013, in which he advised Jordan to adopt the Rabat Action Plan and include it in relevant legislation.

The study also discussed extensively the state of religious tolerance in Jordan as the antithesis of extremism and hatred, and reviewed the efforts of Jordan in the international arena and the UN to promote the spirit of co-existence and harmony among religions, and to maximize the ethics of tolerance.

In this context, the study stopped at length before the Amman Message, then the Royal initiative for a World Interfaith Harmony Week, which has become an international

UN occasion celebrated in February every year.

The study said that, although Jordan showed unlimited predisposition to religious tolerance and interfaith harmony, there have been reports critical of Jordan in its policies related to religions and sects. Some of the criticism comes because of Jordan's reservation on some provisions contained in international conventions which Jordan exempted from its signature.

The study also stopped before models of hate speech in the Jordanian media by monitoring inflammatory sermons by the Muslim Brotherhood and the Islamic Action Front political party. This incitement reached in some Jordanian media to the level of a discourse of hate and direct accusations of treason; however the government did not interfere to hold the people responsible for this discourse accountable.

The study also discussed forms of hate speech, which were clearly evident in Jordanian media against the Syrian refugees, like the Egyptian media. This xenophobic and inflammatory discourse went beyond Syrian refugees to reach Palestinian refugees, albeit through innuendo.

The study stopped before models of discrimination against Jordanian women and incitement against supporters of women's constitutional right to pass their nationality to their children from a non-Jordanian father. This humanitarian, constitutional, and legal demand was transformed, when opponents of this right



began to speak of Palestinian refugees and Jordanians of Palestinian origin, into xenophobia, or a demographic phobia.

This chapter stopped before the effects of the sectarian conflict in Syria on the Jordanian media and how they dealt with it. The study affirmed that the discourse of sectarian hatred seemed very modest in the official Jordanian media, but it was more clearly visible in the electronic media, and overwhelmingly so in social media, specifically Facebook. This discourse was not completely absent from private satellite channels, where it was clear and

frank beyond denial.

The study stressed that Jordanian mosques saw the fiercest wave of sectarian incitement, specifically against the Shi'ah, and to a lesser extent against Christians. This wave was unprecedented in Jordanian mosques, which demonstrates that the mosque has become part of the propaganda machine of sectarianism against the Shi'ah, Hezbollah, [pan-Arab] nationalists, the Baath Party, and others. Mosques that prayed for Hezbollah's victory in 2006 now dubbed it a satanic party that is cursed in the mosque and from the pulpits.



## Media Legal Aid Unit (MELAD) attends 830 sessions and expands its activities in the Arab world

### MELAD - Jordan litigated in 84 cases related to journalism before the courts in 2013

The Media Legal Aid Unit (MELAD), which is operated by the Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ), continued to provide legal services to journalists in Jordan in 2013.

As CDFJ celebrated the 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its foundation on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2013, the status and role of MELAD in providing legal aid to journalists has become well established after 13 years since it launched its activities on a regular basis in 2002.

The legal assistance that MELAD- Jordan provides for journalists has become a role model in the Arab world. The first success was the launch of MELAD's activities as a legal aid unit for journalists under the umbrella of the United Group in Egypt. At the same time, MELAD in Morocco started its activities in partnership with Adaleh Association for Fair Trail. Moreover, MELAD in Tunis is expected to launch its activities in 2014 in cooperation and partnership with the Tunisian Organization to Protect Journalists, after lawyers received specialized training in both Tunisia and Libya.

The creation of legal aid units for journalists in four Arab countries was achieved through the support of the Arab Partnership Programme of the UK Foreign Office. It is hoped to universalize this experience in other Arab countries because of the importance of providing

legal aid to journalists, given the legislative restrictions on media freedom.

In 2013, MELAD -Jordan was engaged in representing journalists from different media in 71 cases. This brought the total number of cases handled by MELAD in 2013 to 84.

Another success MELAD achieved was winning all the cases concluded 2013. Verdicts were pronounced in eight cases, out of which two were acquittals, five were non-liability, and in the eighth case the court ruled against the civil claim against the defendant.

The High Court of Justice (Administrative Court) turned down three cases filed by MELAD on behalf of the Arab Reporters for Investigative Journalism (ARIJ) on issues related to the right of access to information.

Some stability was observed in judicial opinions regarding jurisdiction, after promulgation of the Amendment to the Press and Publications Law - 2012, which stated explicitly that electronic publications are subject to the provisions of the Press and Publications Law, which gave jurisdiction to review press and publication cases to the Court of First Instance of Amman in its capacity as criminal court (Publications Room).

But the Office of the Public Prosecutor continued to file charges against journalists over allegation of publication-related crimes. The accusations most commonly used in these decisions were of violating Articles 5, 7, and 38 / d of the Press and Publication Law. The Public Prosecutor also added a new crime based on the amendment of the provisions on licensing in the amended law of 2012, which is issuing a publication without license in accordance with the provisions of Article 48 of the Press and Publications Law.

Accordingly, one item published in the media became liable to more than one incriminating legal provision. It should be noted that Article 5 of the Press and Publications Law included four crimes: not searching for the truth, failure to observe accuracy, failure to observe seriousness, and failure to observe objectivity in presenting material in the media. Another offense is failure to refrain from publishing material that is contrary to the principles of freedom, national responsibility, human rights and the values of Arab and Islamic nation.

Article 7 of the Press and Publications Law includes eight crimes that are:

- Lack of respect for the public freedoms of others.
- Failure to protect the rights of others.
- Violating the sanctity of the private lives of others.
- Lack of balance in presenting material in the media.
- Lack of objectivity in presenting

material in the media.

- Lack of integrity in presenting material in the media.
- Failure to refrain from attracting or acquiring ads.
- Non-compliance with the provisions and principles of the Code of Honor of the Jordan Press Association.

Article 38 / d provides a ban on the publication of any material that includes defamation, slander, or disparagement of individuals or [material] that touches their personal freedoms or contains false information or rumors against them.

These [multiple] crimes, of which journalists can be accused in any one case, were not given a clear conceptual definition by the judiciary. Judicial decisions continued to be explained and justified by taking the correctness and truthfulness of information in published material as the fundamental criterion for conviction or non-liability. This situation calls for a comprehensive review of the text of the Press and Publication Law to address flexible terms that can be stretched, giving the Public Prosecutor opportunities to file charges against journalists.

In another area, in 2013, MELAD expanded its awareness-raising and advocacy activities. On 12<sup>th</sup> November 2013, MELAD organized a forum for legal dialogue that was attended by the Minister of State for Media Affairs and Communications Dr. Mohammad Al-Momani as well as judges, lawyers, journalists, civil society organizations, parliamentarians and government officials.

In the same context, MELAD organized a meeting to raise awareness among journalists of mechanisms for providing legal aid services, as well as prior and post facto legal advice for journalists and media organizations. MELAD lawyers answered questions raised by journalists in the meeting.

MELAD explained during the meeting that legal advice can be sought either through MELAD's hotline or by e-mail.

To raise lawyers' interest in specializing in media issues, a training workshop was organized in the period 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> October, which was attended by 20 lawyers at the Dead Sea.

During 2013, MELAD's lawyers attended 830 hearings, at an average of 16 sessions a week, and examined 38 witnesses both for the prosecution, plaintiffs claiming civil compensation, and the defense of journalists. Forty three depositions were

submitted defending journalists in lawsuits filed against them.

MELAD lawyers also held 31 regular meeting in 2013.

In addition, MELAD continued its efforts to provide studies and alternative draft laws, most notably a comprehensive memorandum of all laws governing freedom of information, which the CDFJ presented to the National Steering Committee and Public Freedoms Committee of Parliament. The memorandum included notes on restrictions imposed on media freedom, proposed alternative activities and explained the reasons for them.

MELAD also continued to cooperate with the Judicial Council, after it contributed to upgrading the skills of heads of courts in communication with the media, and contributed to the establishment of an information office for the Judicial Council.



## SANAD

### Network for Media Freedom Defenders in The Arab World

The Network for Media Freedom Defenders in The Arab World (SANAD) is a coalition of civil society institutions advocating the freedom of the press.

SANAD was established in implementation of recommendation by the First Forum for the Defenders of Media Freedom in the Arab World, organized by the center for Defending the Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ) in Amman, in December 2012, immediately after the birth of the Arab Spring.

The first achievement of SANAD was the “Ain” (eye) Program for Monitoring and Documentation of Violations against the Media. Work was kicked off by training national teams to monitor and document such violations in Egypt and Tunisia, while work was still underway in Jordan to achieve that goal. It then formed another national team in Yemen, and conducted a monitoring training in Iraq in cooperation with Kurdistan Journalists Syndicate.

Under Ain Program, a plan was designed to expand in the Arab world through setting up national teams for monitoring and documentation, within a realistic and workable timeframe.

The national teams will be working on detecting and documenting violations against the media in the countries where they function, applying a scientific rights-based approach consistent with international media and human rights criteria. Side by side with that, professional researchers will be monitoring violations in the countries where Ain monitors do not exist, relying on data collected from the media, communication with rights group and monitoring their reports on violations against the press, along with field visits and direct contacts with journalists who are victims of these violations.

SANAD seeks to institutionalize efforts exerted to defend the media freedom in the Arab world. Towards that end, it has launched its web-based observatory to shed light on the violations against journalists, providing an electronic platform that works effectively to expose violators, mobilize support for journalists and offer a venue for networking between advocates of media freedoms.

SANAD will continue embracing the Forum for Defenders of Media Freedom in the Arab World, and working to expand the base of media supporters, eyeing a wider margin of freedom, enhancement of achievements and attracting international experts to back Arab journalists who are struggling with huge challenges to win their freedom and independence.



وحدة رصد وتوثيق  
الانتهاكات الواقعة على الإعلام

## Ain

### Unit for Monitoring and Documentation of Violations against Media

#### Vision:

To curb violations against journalists and media institutions in order to strengthen the freedom and independence of the media

#### Mission:

To monitor and document the problems, abuses and violations targeting journalists and media institutions as they carry out their professional duties

#### Objectives:

- To set up qualified and specialized working teams of lawyers, journalists and researchers to monitor and document violations against journalists and media institutions in accordance with the internationally recognized norms and standards
- To stimulate journalists to disclose the problems and abuses to which they are exposed during their work and activate reporting mechanisms
- To develop and institutionalize mechanisms of monitoring the problems and violations against journalists
- To educate journalists on their rights and familiarize them with international standards of the freedom of the media, and the nature of violations they are subject to
- To demand that governments take measures to curb abuses against the media and hold perpetrators accountable
- To urge parliaments to upgrade relevant legislation in a manner that safeguards the freedom of the media, curb abuses committed against journalists and hold perpetrators accountable
- To provide support and legal assistance to journalists who are exposed to problems and violations, including helping them obtain fair compensation for the violations they suffer and sue perpetrators
- To use the mechanisms of the United Nations to curb violations against the freedom of the media and ensure justice for journalists.



## Media Legal Aid Unit for Journalists (MELAD)

### Objectives:

1. Assigning lawyers to defend journalists who are detained or prosecuted for carrying out their duties.
2. Providing legal consultation to journalists without increasing restrictions or self-censorship.
3. Enhancing the legal awareness of the journalists and helping them exercise their constitutional rights of expression and defending the society's right to knowledge without violating the law.
4. Exhorting lawyers to give attention to journalism and media freedom issues, and developing their legal skills in this field.
5. Presenting draft laws to the parliament and government to improve the legal structure governing the freedom of media in Jordan in harmony with the international standards.
6. Establishing streams of communication with the judicial authority to enhance press freedoms and create an understanding of the international standards for the freedom of media.

### Mechanism of work:

1. Rebuilding the media legal aid unit by recruiting specialized qualified lawyers, organizing the unit's mechanisms of work and activating the voluntary efforts of lawyers.
2. Organizing advanced and specialized training for a number of lawyers who took part in previous training workshops with CDFJ, and involving new lawyers who are already engaged in defending newspapers, radio and TV stations to enrich their experience and encourage them to support the efforts of media legal aid unit.
3. Re-distributing and restructuring the work of media legal aid unit MELAD along three lines:
  - Defending journalists before juridical authorities and extending legal advice through building a network of lawyers which can provide legal protection for the journalists in a proper and professional manner.
  - Documenting the lawsuits filed against journalists and institutions in Jordanian courts.
  - Studying and analyzing verdicts issued in press and publication cases to determine their compatibility with international standards and to identify the Jordanian judiciary trends in dealing with media-related cases.
4. Establishing a forum for exchanging expertise on the freedom of media between judges, lawyers, and journalists
5. Providing legal advice to journalists through the following website: [www.cdfj.org](http://www.cdfj.org)
6. Activating the hotline service and providing journalists with the names and telephone numbers of lawyers working with the media legal aid unit to seek their assistance in urgent cases.



## مركز حماية وحرية الصحفيين

Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists

### Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ)

Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists [CDFJ] was established in 1998 as a civil society organization that works on defending media freedom in Jordan; the center was established after a series of major setbacks on a local level, starting with issuing the temporary press and publication law in 1997, which added more restrictions on media and caused many newspapers to shut down.

CDFJ works on protecting freedoms and democracy in Jordan and the Arab world, in addition to respect of human rights, justice, equal rights, and development in the society encouraging non-violence and open dialogue.

CDFJ always maintain an independent role like any other civil society organizations, and is not part of the political work, but in terms of defending media and journalists freedoms CDFJ stands against all policies and legislations that may impose restrictions on media freedom.

CDFJ is active on regional level to develop media freedom and strengthen the skills and professionalism of journalists in the Arab countries, through specialized and customized programs and activities, in addition CDFJ works with media and the civil society on protecting the democracy and promoting respect of human rights principles.

#### CDFJ Vision:

Creating a democratic environment in the Arab Countries that protects media freedom and freedom of expression and enhances the society's right in knowledge through building professional Journalists committed to the international standards of independent and free media.

#### CDFJ Mission:

CDFJ is a non-government organization, committed to defending the freedom and security of journalists through addressing the violations to which they are exposed, and building sustainable professional capacities as well as enabling them to have free access to information, along with developing and changing restrictive media related legislations, and building a supportive political, social, and cultural environment for free and independent media.

#### CDFJ main Goals are:

- Supporting the freedom and independence of media organizations and journalists.
- Defending journalists, protecting their safety, and stand against the violations committed against them.
- Strengthening the professionalism of media and its role in defending democracy, freedoms and reform.
- Developing the legislative, political, social, and cultural environments that embrace media and journalists.

#### CDFJ Pillars:

- FIRST: Protection of Journalists
- SECOND: Developing Professionalism of Media
- THIRD: Developing the Environment Surrounding Media

Amman – University Street – Saeed Tamimi St. Near Ministry of Agrculture  
 P.O Box 961167 Amman 11196 Jordan Tel. (+962 - 6) 5160820/5 Fax. (+962 - 6) 5602785  
 E-mail: [info@cdfj.org](mailto:info@cdfj.org) Web: <http://www.cdfj.org>