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Notes

In this paper Japanese names and words are romanised according to the modified Hepburn system, unless the words are commonly used in the English language, i.e. Tokyo. This means that long vowel sounds are transcribed using macrons; long a, u, e, o are transcribed as ā, ĕ, ē, ō respectively with the exception for long i which is indicated by ii and long ei sound which retains its original spelling. The grammatical particles 「は」「へ」「を」 are transliterated as wa, e, o respectively and the syllabic 「ん」 is indicated by n.

All the words of Japanese origin are written in italics, except for proper nouns. Japanese names are written in the Japanese order; that is with the family name followed by the first name.

All the translation in this paper, unless otherwise stated, are carried out by me in a manner which retains the meaning of the original source, rather than making it a literal translation.
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1 Introduction

During the two years I lived and studied in the North-East China I encountered many Chinese students from all around the country as well as many exchange students from South Korea and Japan. These encounters gave me an insight of the outlook they have on the neighbouring countries and its residents. The proximity of these three countries made me naively believe that although there is a fierce competition on the economical level between them the general public attitudes are friendly overall.
To my great surprise many of the Chinese students expressed their profound contempt for Japan uttering hateful statements such as: “We should get a revenge for the Nanjing massacre by raping and killing all the Japanese women”, “I am looking forward to a war between China and Japan” or by simply referring to Japanese people by the derogatory term, “Jap”.  

In fact, there are numerous unresolved issues between these three countries. Just to mention a few there is the “comfort women” issue, “Nanjing massacre” and according to China and South Korea lack of an official apology and compensation for the war crimes committed by Japan which all go back to the wartime. Then there are also some more recent issues such as the island dispute and the revision of Japanese history textbooks. Acknowledging these facts explains the underlying contempt Chinese students and even some Korean students feel towards Japan.

I inquired with the Japanese students on their views regarding how they felt about this hostility and what their attitudes toward China and South Korea were. Although some of them have experienced hostile behaviour or remarks from the Chinese they were not preoccupied by it. On the contrary, they actually appeared unaware or oblivious to the historical facts and seemed not to be concerned with the situation.

That is why when I first heard of the escalating hate speech demonstrations in Japan I was taken by surprise. The Japanese students I have encountered made me believe that the Japanese society, at least not openly, is not hostile to foreigners. This got me to question the differences in attitudes towards the hate speech issue, among Japan’s young population and the reality of today’s Japan, where the government in my opinion appears to be passive in regard of discriminatory behaviour.

1.1 Objectives and Research Question

From the academic perspective, researching the views and attitudes of the young and educated groups of individuals in a country is particularly interesting as it may indicate the direction in

---

1 Shao riiben (小日本) from Chinese xiao riben which is derogatory term for a Japanese person with the literally meaning: “little Japan”
2 “Comfort women” - Women forced into sex slavery during the World War II by the Japanese Imperial Army Nanjing massacre - An episode during the Second Sino-Japanese War of mass murder and mass rape by Japanese troops against the residents of Nanjing, the capital of the Republic of China
3 Island disputes, such as determining whether Senkaku Islands belong to China or to Japan. Revision of Japanese history textbooks controversy: governmental efforts to alternate the content of the textbooks in order to for instance whitewash the actions of the Empire of Japan during World War II.
which the country is heading politically and ideologically.

The aim of this study is to explore the attitudes of Japanese university students and also establish the governmental stance regarding the escalating hate speech activities. By doing so I intend to examine the differences and the similarities the Japanese students might have with the governmental standpoint. I also intend to research and analyse the underlying reasons for both students’ and ruling party’s outlook on the hate speech issue.

The core research questions of my study are:

*How does the Japanese students’ outlook on the hate speech issue compare to the governmental stance?*

I also intent to discuss and speculate around my secondary research question which is:

*What are the underlying reasons for the views of the Japanese students and the ruling party?*

### 1.2 Disposition

My paper is dispositioned into five sections that come in the order that I thought to be the most coherent for the reader. The five sections are as follow: 1 Introduction, 2 Theory, Methods and Material, 3 Background Overview, 4 Discussion, 5 Conclusions.

In Introduction I present my motives for conduction of this research as well as I introduce my objectives and the research question. In order to clarify for the reader the content of this paper I also decided to include definitions of the two key terms of this study which are “minority” and “hate speech”.

In the following section I present the theories that I intend to apply to the analysis of my study, which are cultural nationalism theory and nihonjinron. Then I go on to describing the materials and the methods that I chose to employ in my research. The purpose of this section is to present to the reader the methodology of this study.

The next section, Background Overview, is the source of information concerning the current situation in Japan regarding hate speech and the issues surrounding it. For someone who has never heard of the issue before I decided to begin by presenting the foremost organization spreading hate speech, Zaitoku-kai and its motives as well as its members. Then I state an example of hate speech demonstration which gained attention in the Japanese media, in order to give the reader more insight into the actual situation. In this section I also discuss the international laws as well as the Japanese laws that intend to tackle the hate speech issue. I
thought it was important part of the background information as the laws in Japan reflect and also can assist with understanding the ongoing issues.

The discussion section consists of two parts. The first part introduces the governmental stance concerning hate speech obtained from two surveys. Furthermore I dedicate one part to present Shinzo Abe, the current Prime Minister in Japan, as I believe that the views of the leader of a country reflect the current political situation. In the second part I introduce the outlook of the Japanese university students. As the objective of my research is to compare the views of these two groups I use a survey as well as an online interview created by me in order to obtain the views of the students.

In Conclusions I make the final analysis and comparison of the governmental standpoint and the students’ outlook on the hate speech issue in Japan. I discuss the similarities the two groups share and attempt to speculate around the reasons behind their views by applying the two aforementioned theories.

1.3 Definitions
1.3.1 What is Hate Speech?
In order to gain a better understanding of the problematic of hate speech it is essential to define and specify what in this paper is referred to as hate speech.

There is a wide range of definitions for hate speech such as the one according to the Canadian Oxford Dictionary that defines it as: “speech expressing hatred or intolerance of other social groups, esp. on the basis of race or sexual orientation”.

Professor of Political Theory Bhikhu Parekh’s definition explains hate speech in further detail. According to Parekh “Hate speech expresses, encourages, stirs up, or incites hatred against a group of individuals, distinguished by a particular feature or set of features such as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, nationality, and sexual orientation”. Furthermore, it consists of three essential features:

1) It is targeted against a specified individual or a group of individuals and based on arbitrary and

---

6 Ibid., p. 40.
normatively irrelevant features.

2) It stigmatizes the target group by assigning qualities that are widely considered undesirable.
3) It encourages and implies justifying of discrimination caused by the undesirable qualities ascribed to the target group.

Furthermore Parekh means that hate speech is often expressed in offensive and insulting language which makes it more powerful, but it is not always the case. It can be expressed in a more subtle way, what matters is putting the content in the right context.\footnote{7}

He also states that hate speech, despite its hateful nature does not necessarily lead to violence or public disorder. The content of hate speech has a long-term effect on the target group and therefore it is a mistake to define hate speech as something that immediately results in aggression and disorder.\footnote{8}

\subsection{1.3.2 Defining Minority}

From my experience some Japanese people seem to believe that the Japanese society is ethnically and culturally homogenous indicating that there is no cultural or ethnical diversity among the citizens. Ethnic and cultural diversity of Japanese society is less noticeable, especially in comparison with societies of some other developed countries.\footnote{9} According to the United Nations’ International Migration 2013 Chart the percentage of immigrants in Japan amounts merely to 1.9\% of the total population. Nonetheless 1.9\% of the total population equals to over 2.4 million people, which is a considerable number of immigrants. Moreover, the actual number might be even higher as the estimates of United Nations were based on the population of foreign citizens and do not include foreign-born population nor the ethnic minorities such as Ainu or Okinawans who are Japanese passport holders.\footnote{10}

When discussing issues concerning discrimination, in particular hate speech, it is important to define, the target of the discrimination in the hate speech demonstrations, namely the minority groups in accordance with the existing international laws.

Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)

\footnote{7}Ibid.
\footnote{8}Ibid., p. 41.
\footnote{9}In comparison the immigrant percentage of total population in Sweden is 15.9\%.
specifically protects the rights of the members of ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities giving them the freedom to exert their own culture, religion or language.\textsuperscript{11} For the purpose of Article 27 it was necessary to make an attempt in establishing the meaning and criteria for “minority”.\textsuperscript{12}

There is one definition that is most widely cited in the literature and that most of the international definitions rely on. It even serves as a guideline when outlining the criteria for the legal definition of minority.\textsuperscript{13}

A group numerically smaller to the rest of the population of the State, in a non-dominant position, whose members – being nationals of the State – possess ethnic, religious or linguistic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language.\textsuperscript{14}

This definition consists of five main criteria: (1) numerical size, (2) non-dominance, (3) citizenship, (4) otherness and (5) self-consciousness.\textsuperscript{15} The analysis of these criteria was later applied in the General Comment on Article 27 when defining the official criteria for ethnic, religious or linguistic minority.\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{2 Theory, Methods and Material}

\textbf{2.1 Theory}

The theory applied when analysing the findings of this study is cultural nationalism theory along with the theories embedded in the \textit{nihonjinron}.\textsuperscript{17} The cultural nationalism theory is especially relevant when analysing the governmental stance and the problems concerning regulations for hate speech in contemporary Japan.

\textsuperscript{11} Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language.


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 18.


\textsuperscript{15} Wheatley, pp. 18–19. Wheatley’s definition is not fully applicable in Japan since double citizenship is not allowed. For that reason for instance many choose to keep their parents’ citizenship even if they are born and raised in Japan. Instead of citizenship they hold a permanent resident permit that basically has the same function.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 29.

\textsuperscript{17} The theories about the Japanese
The current ruling party is oftentimes described as rightist and nationalistic. However I believe that these views are not necessarily of a racist background but rather originating from the patriotic spirit deeply embedded in the Japanese culture described and analysed in the nihonjinron. As Benedict Anderson argues in Imagined communities: “nationalism thinks in terms of historical destinies, while racism dreams of eternal contaminations”, meaning that the “loathsome” traits will always remain, for instance Jews are always Jews. He then goes on saying that racism originates in ideologies of class, and not in those of nation and for that reason racism manifests itself as domestic repression and domination.\(^{18}\)

In my view although the discrimination in Japan seen in the hate speech demonstrations exists it is not of a racist origin, but rather caused by the deep need for preserving “Japaneseness” described in nihonjinron. Moreover, lack of the immediate response from the government that could be interpreted as allowing discriminative behaviours is also caused by the ideologies created by nihonjinron.

In order to analyse the opinions and views of both Japanese students and the ruling party I also refer to a sociological enquiry called Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan written by Yoshino Kosaku who is now Professor and Chair of the Department of Sociology at Sophia University.\(^{19}\) The book examines cultural nationalism and national identity as well as it analyses contemporary Japanese society. According to Yoshino Kosaku, cultural nationalism in contrast to political nationalism\(^ {20}\) aims to preserve the cultural identity of the nation, because it regards the nation as the product of its history and culture.\(^ {21}\) “In short, cultural nationalism is concerned with the distinctiveness of the cultural community as the essence of a nation”.\(^ {22}\)

2.1.1 Nihonjinron – The Theories about the Japanese

Nihonjinron literally translated means “discussions/theories of the Japanese”. It is a collective name for all the writings manifesting Japanese uniqueness, mostly representing the views of and written by intellectuals and intelligentsia. The nihonjinron explains all the everyday occurrences in cultural terms of certain traits being uniquely Japanese. What the nihonjinron actually does is

---


\(^{20}\) Since understanding political nationalism is not essential for this study I deliberately chose to omit it.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., p. 1.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 1.
that it describes Japanese identity as the anti-image of foreignness and as a result creates the images of “the other” being everyone who is not Japanese. A classic example of the contrasting traits between what is considered Japanese and “the other” is the mode of communication that is often emphasised in the *nihonjinron*. The Japanese mode of communication is described as non-logical, non-verbal and emotive as opposed to the logical, verbal and rational mode of communication of “the other”. Since the Japanese have for a long time considered themselves to be excluded from the “central” civilisations (such as China and the West) the writings of the *nihonjinron* emphasise “their particularistic difference in order to differentiate themselves from the universal Chinese and Westerners. The *nihonjinron* or discussions of Japanese uniqueness are, therefore, discussions of ‘particularistic’ cultural differences of Japan from the ‘universal’ civilisation.” It is worth noting that the ideas of Japanese uniqueness discussed in the *nihonjinron* oftentimes cannot be empirically proven and are just used to reinforce the Japanese identity.

**2.2 Material and Method**

Over recent years the discrimination related issues such as hate speech demonstrations have gained a lot of attention and for that reason there are numerous researches conducted in this field both by Japanese and foreign scholars. There is even a vast number of reports concerning hate speech created by local and international NGOs as well as the reports on Japan’s current situation generated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (MOFA). Japanese media also tackles this issue extensively by creating TV documentaries and publishing newspaper articles on a daily basis with updated information on the hate speech issue. Therefore, obtaining the background information concerning the views of the Japanese government does not prove very difficult. On the other hand, finding the information on the group of individuals that Japanese university students represent is not as simple.

Most of the research and the reports as well as the information presented by the media concerns the general opinions or the governmental stand point and does not focus on a specific group of individuals. Nevertheless there is a major study conducted among around one thousand university students from different universities in Japan, which makes this research possible.

---

23 Ibid., pp. 10–11.
24 Ibid., p. 11.
25 Ibid., pp. 11–12.
“Hate speech and youth—a survey of Koreans in Japan and Japanese University students living in urban centers—” is the title of the survey used as the primary data for my research.\textsuperscript{26} To complement this survey I have created a structured online interview form, which was distributed through Facebook\textsuperscript{27} to twenty Japanese university students in the period between April 27 – May 10 year 2015. Since all the interviewees’ native tongue is the Japanese language the interview is also conducted in Japanese in order to ensure that participants fully understand the meaning of the questions and at the same time can express their opinions and thoughts unlimited by the language barriers that might have occurred if the interview was conducted in English. Due to the resource and time limitations I was unable to conduct face-to-face interviews with the participants; nevertheless the answers provided by the interviewees constitute an immense contribution to the research. The data collected from a limited number of participants is inevitably insufficient to serve as a scientific proof, however it still provides an in-depth understanding of students’ attitudes towards hate speech and most importantly has an explanatory function when interpreting the results of the aforementioned survey. The interview questions in the original form can be viewed in the appendix.

In order to make a comparison between the students and the government I also refer to two surveys. One conducted by newspaper Asahi in cooperation with Tokyo University in 2014 “Takushita omoi, Giin no zure”.\textsuperscript{28} And the other one conducted by NGO Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Japan (ERD Net) in 2012 called “Emergency survey regarding hate speech among all the members of national Diet”.\textsuperscript{29}

In this study I also use as reference a research paper written for by Ito Kenichiro a researcher at Ritsumeikan University for the purpose of The 4th International Conference on

\textsuperscript{26} Izawa, Yasuki (井沢泰樹) & others, “Heito Supiichi to Wakamono no ishiki —Daitoshiken no Daigakusei no chōsa kara— ヘイトスピーチと若者の意識 —大都市圏の大学生の調査から—(Hate speech and youth —a survey of Koreans in Japan and Japanese University students living in urban centers—)”, The Bulletin of the Institute of Human Sciences, Toyo University, 2014.
\textsuperscript{27} A social community network on the Internet
\textsuperscript{29} “Heito supiichi ni kansuru zenkokuankaigi’in kinnyūi ankōto shūkei kekka「ヘイトスピーチに関する全国会議員緊急アンケート」集計結果 (Emergency survey regarding hate speech among all the members of national Diet)”, NGO Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Japan (ERD Net), 2012, <www.imadr.net/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/e9a72ecd6678e6c21f513b467f2acc3c.pdf> [accessed 19 May 2015]
Sustainable Future for Human Security. Furthermore, I refer to two recently published books written by the experts in the field of human rights and discrimination. Morooka Yasuko, a Japanese human rights lawyer and social activist, is the author of a book called Heito Spiichi to wa Nani ka explaining different aspects of hate speech in contemporary Japan. The other book concerning hate speech organizations and its different forms is written by a Japanese freelance journalist, Yasuda Koichi, who has followed Zaitoku-kai (the main group organising hate speech demonstrations in Japan), since it was established in 2007. Yasudas Netto to aikoku: Zaitoku-kai no ‘yami’ o oikakete explains in detail the motives and the mentality of the individuals who participate in hate speech demonstrations.

3 Background Overview

3.1 Zaitoku-kai: Organization Spreading Hate Speech

The prominent organization spreading hate speech in Japan called Zaitoku-kai (Zainichi Tokken o Yurusanai Shimin no Kai meaning Association of Citizens who do not Tolerate Privileges of Foreign Residents in Japan) was founded in December 2006 by its leader Sakurai Makoto. It is estimated that there are over 15,000 members nationwide and the highest number of participants during hate speech demonstrations has so far been 2,000 whereas normally there are less than 100 participants. Based on the 2013 election to the upper house where Suzuki Yoshiyuki the leader of an extreme-right-wing party gained almost 80,000 votes in metropolitan Tokyo one can expect that the number of people who sympathise with the principles of Zaitoku-kai is much larger.

Although Zaitoku-kai is said not to tolerate privileges of foreign residents in reality as they state on their official website the targeted minority group is limited to Korean residents in Japan (Zainichi-Koreans). According to Marooka the main goals and objectives of Zaitoku-kai are the abolishment of the special privileges given to the Zainichi-Koreans, particularly the

31 Morooka, Yasuko (師岡康子), Heito Spiichi to ha Nani ka へイトスピーチとは何か [What is Hate Speech], Tōkyō-to Chiyoda-ku, Iwanami Shinsho, 2013.
32 Yasuda, Koichi (安田浩一), Netto to aikoku: Zaitoku-kai no ‘yami’ o oikakete ネットと愛国 在特会の「闇」を追いかけで [Internet and Patriotism: Investigating the Darkness of Zaitoku-kai], Tokyo, Kōdan-sha, 2012.
33 Ito, p. 435.
34Zaitoku-kai’s official website: http://www.zaitokukai.info/modules/about/zai/speech.html [accessed 16 April 2015] Following are the three common terms used in Japanese when referring to Korean residents in Japan: 1) Zainichi-Kankokujuin 在日韓国人 2) Zainichi-Chōsenjin 在日朝鮮人 3) Zainichi-Korian 在日コリアン
special residency status in order to ensure all the foreign residents equal treatment. However it appears that their ideology is built on the belief that as long as you are not a Japanese citizen you do not deserve equal rights.\textsuperscript{35}

\textbf{3.1.1 Motives and Members’ Mentality}

This section is a summary of the analysis made by Ito regarding motives and mentality of the members of Zaitoku-Kai.

According to Ito some of the basic arguments and motives that the members of Zaitoku-kai claim to be true and that have triggered their protests are the following: (1) Koreans do not have to pay taxes, (2) they receive social aid therefore do not have to work, (3) crime rate by Zainichi-Koreans is much higher, and the list continues. Although most of the arguments can be easily refuted, for instance by stating the fact that the crime rates in the urban areas amongst the Japanese and Zainichi-Koreans are virtually the same, the followers of Zaitoku-kai uncritically believe the claims to be true.\textsuperscript{36}

Ito goes on saying that another typical claim origins in historical revisionism, in which Zaitoku-kai argues that Japan fought for a good cause during the World War II. For that reason there is no need for apology to the invaded countries, such as China and Korea, and instead Japanese should feel proud of their history. According to Zaitoku-kai Chinese and Koreans who demand apology and compensation for the war crimes are liars and beggars, and this argument serves as yet another factor for their hatred against these nations.\textsuperscript{37}

It is desirable to identify what kind of individuals are attracted to the ideologies spread by Zaitoku-kai. Ito thinks that it might be reasonable to assume that what connects the participants of the demonstrations is the need of an object of hatred, but there are also other characteristics that they have in common. There is the desire for disorder which is emphasized in the content of their speeches that are offensive and incite aggression. Another feature is their rightist and conservative political views and opposing the ideologies of the left-wing. They also share the idea of being the chosen minority that is aware of injustices that go unnoticed by the majority. The sense of being a minority that is unrepresented and excluded from the mainstream society makes the participants vulnerable and provides them with the so called “victim mentality”

\textsuperscript{35} Morooka, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{36} Ito, p. 436.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., p. 437.
which is proved to be the foundation for racist beliefs. Attacking minorities helps them restore their own dignity.\(^\text{38}\)

According to Ito many Japanese assume that the majority of the participants are jobless youths, but actually there is a wide diversity of the participants, from casually dressed young males, to businessmen, housewives or elderly people. Therefore it is incorrect to conclude that this sort of behaviour arose from joblessness, but rather from a sense of insecurity about the future and isolation, as well as the desire for an identity.\(^\text{39}\) “Theoretically, for those who see themselves as the excluded and deprived, being ‘Japanese’ is one of few identities that assure their dignity”.\(^\text{40}\)

3.2 Hate Speech Demonstrations: the Case of Korean School in Kyoto

There are various methods used for dissemination of hateful content targeted at the minorities in Japan. One of the most widely used means of spreading the discriminatory content is the Internet, which also serves as the platform for organising the demonstrations, which are taking place on the streets of the biggest Japanese cities in the areas where the foreign nationals reside. Those are the notorious hate speech demonstrations that according to Norikoe Net’s internet investigation, year 2013 took place at least 360 times nationwide.\(^\text{41}\)

To gain more insight into the actual demonstrations and their severity one infamous case of hate speech demonstration against First Korean Primary School in Kyoto is described in Yasudas book is summarised here.

On the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) of December 2009 a dozen or so of Zaitoku-kai’s members gathered in front of the school’s main gate in order to protest against school’s allegedly illegal usage of the public park outside the school gates as the school’s playground and sports field. In accordance with the statement given by the school the usage of the park was consulted with and approved by Kyoto city’s officials as well as by the local residents. Nevertheless, the members of Zaitoku-kai appeared outside the school gates to express their “discontent”

\(^{38}\) Ibid., pp. 439–441.
\(^{39}\) Ibid., p. 441.
\(^{40}\) Ibid., p. 442.
\(^{41}\) Heito supiichi to reishizumu o norikoeru kokusai nettowâku ヘイトスピーチとレイシズムを乗り越える国際ネットワーク (The International Network to Overcome Hate Speech and Racism) <http://norikoenet.org/fact.html> [accessed 14 May 2015]
with “grounds being stolen from the Japanese people”.

Since the demonstration started in the early afternoon the Korean children were in the middle of their classes and were able to hear the content of the demonstration, which actually had very little to do with “the park being overtaken by the school” issue and instead focused on making hateful statements about the Koreans.

“Such thing as Korean school should be destroyed!” “Koreans stole the land from our ancestors. You raped Japanese women and stole the land!” “And you stink like kimchi!” “You Koreans should eat shit!” When the demonstrators were told to be quiet, because there are children inside the response was “You’re telling us to be quiet, because of some children. What children? They’re just children of spies.” And when the school stated that they were during the negotiations with Kyoto city officials, the demonstrators responded saying: “Agreements are made between human beings. Humans and Koreans do not make agreements!” Although the police was present the only thing they did was to utter a warning “Stop it”, but essentially they were just standing beside and observing the situation. This might be an evidence of prioritising the right to freedom of expression above intentional harm, such demonstration may cause to the targeted group, in this case Korean school and its students.

When one of the parents later on was interviewed about the aftermath of the incident she said that she was afraid to be recognized as a Korean in public places, because she might get attacked by someone. The mother also recounted the night on the day of the incident when her 11 year-old daughter asked her: “Why were those people angry? They told us: ‘go back, go back’. But omoni [Korean word for mom]. Where should we go back? Do we have a place we can go back to?” These were extremely difficult questions to answer for the mother of the traumatised child.

The demonstrations outside the Korean school in Kyoto were held on three occasion between 2009 and 2010 and the video footage of the demonstrations was posted online by Zaitoku-kai.

---

42 Yasuda, p. 95.
43 Ibid., pp. 97–98.
44 Ibid., pp. 102–103.
45 “12 gatsu 4 ka Kyoto jidō kōen o mudan de kōtei to shite tsukau chōsen gakkō kara dakkan
In June 2014, Zaitoku-kai was sued by the Korean school for the psychological damages they had caused. The most recent update of the lawsuit from December 2014 is that the Supreme Court upheld lower court rulings ordering members of Zaitoku-kai to pay a compensation amounting to 12 million yen to the Korean school. The ruling was based on the fact that Zaitoku-kai’s speeches are against the aforementioned International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The Osaka High Court said, “The innocent students at the school were exposed to a vulgar attack based solely on their ethnic origin and suffered major psychological damage through the irrational acts of racial discrimination”.46

3.3 Freedom of Expression vs. Hate speech – International Laws

Following is an outline of the existing international laws that attempt to tackle the hate speech issue.

Freedom of speech and hate speech have always been problematic and it proves extremely difficult to establish the boundaries between them. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which as of 2010 had been ratified by 165 states, guarantees in Article 19 the right to freedom of expression with certain restrictions.47 Article 20 on the other hand requires the states to prohibit any sort of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that may lead to discrimination, hostility or violence.48

Another important international law relevant to hate speech is Article 4 of the


---

47 The relevant provisions of Article 19 of ICCPR are as follows:
2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.
3. The exercise of the rights provided for in paragraph 2 of this article carries with it special duties and responsibilities. It may therefore be subject to certain restrictions, but these shall only be such as are provided by law and are necessary:
a. For respect of the rights or reputations of others;
b. For the protection of national security or of public order (ordre public), or of public health or morals.
2. Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law.
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) that year 1965 was generated by the United Nations.

Article 4

States Parties condemn all propaganda and all organizations which are based on ideas or theories of superiority of one race or group of persons of one colour or ethnic origin, or which attempt to justify or promote racial hatred and discrimination in any form, and undertake to adopt immediate and positive measures designed to eradicate all incitement to, or acts of, such discrimination and, to this end, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of this Convention, inter alia:

(a) Shall declare an offence punishable by law all dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, incitement to racial discrimination, as well as all acts of violence or incitement to such acts against any race or group of persons of another colour or ethnic origin, and also the provision of any assistance to racist activities, including the financing thereof;

(b) Shall declare illegal and prohibit organizations, and also organized and all other propaganda activities, which promote and incite racial discrimination, and shall recognize participation in such organizations or activities as an offence punishable by law;

(c) Shall not permit public authorities or public institutions, national or local, to promote or incite racial discrimination.  

Hate speech is based exactly on the belief that one group of people is more superior to the other and for that reason Article 4 is often considered to be the key instrument when combating hate speech.

The international laws established in ICCPR and ICERD constitute some problems regarding the interpretation but mostly the implementation of the laws in the courts of the specific countries since each state possesses their own laws and constitution.

Another hindrance is establishing the definitions of the key words that these laws constitute of, namely the definitions of hatred and incitement. Hatred is in fact an emotion and ICCPR, just like most of the relevant instruments, does not define the term. It is extremely difficult to distinguish where the fine line between somewhat harmless racist jokes and the actual

hate speech demonstrations advocating hatred and discrimination should be drawn, especially since measuring the level of hatred is unfeasible. In the case of incitement the Article 20(2) of the ICCPR proscribes its results to be violence, discrimination or hostility, however the courts have yet to apply the similar standards for incitement in the context of hate speech, as they have done in such cases like public disorder or violence.\(^{50}\)

### 3.4 Japanese Constitution and International Laws

To truly understand the difficulties Japan faces, concerning establishment of laws and legislations regulating and setting boundaries for hate speech, familiarising oneself with the Constitution of Japan (from year 1946) is essential. In the Chapter III. Rights and Duties of the People, the Article 21 states as follows: “Freedom of assembly and association as well as speech, press and all other forms of expression are guaranteed. No censorship shall be maintained, nor shall the secrecy of any means of communication be violated”.\(^{51}\)

When it comes to the aforementioned international laws, Japan has finally in September 1995, as one of the last developed countries, accessed the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD). In 1995 during House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, Kōno Yōhei, then the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, presented an explanation as of why it took Japan 30 years to access the ICERD, saying that to access the convention the government needed the time to investigate adjustments necessary in order to protect the basic human rights such as freedom of expression, but the real reasons for accessing the ICERD were “the strong indications made by Prime Minister Murayama”.\(^{52}\) Furthermore, the fact that the United States of America ratified the convention in the preceding year, although with a reservation regarding Article 4, may have also been one of the factors that influenced Japan in the process of decision-making.\(^{53}\) Nevertheless, similarly to the USA, the following reservation was made upon the accession:

---

\(^{50}\) Mendel, pp. 427–428.  
\(^{52}\) Murayama Tomiichi, Prime Minister of Japan between years 1994-1996  
\(^{53}\) Kotani, Junko (小谷順子), “Nihon kokunai ni okeru zōo hyogen (heito supiichi) no kisei ni tsuite no ichi kōsatsu” (日本国内における憎悪表現（ヘイトスピーチ）の規制についての一考察) (An Analysis of Hate Speech...
In applying the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of article 4 of the [said Convention] Japan fulfils the obligations under those provisions to the extent that fulfilment of the obligations is compatible with the guarantee of the rights to freedom of assembly, association and expression and other rights under the Constitution of Japan.  

Regarding the reservation made upon the Article 4 of the convention Japanese government provides an explanation in its First and Second Report on International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (January 2000). In the explanation the importance of the above mentioned Article 21 of the Constitution of Japan guaranteeing freedom of expression is emphasised as one of the most important fundamental human rights making any restrictions impermissible. Nevertheless, it is stated that Japan fulfils the obligations requested by the Convention since it is possible to punish the undesirable practices such as racial discrimination with existing criminal laws and regulations.

3.5 Japanese “Anti-Hate Speech Laws”

The Article 21 in the Constitution of Japan guarantees its citizens, freedom of assembly and speech, and at the same time excludes any restrictions regarding the spread of hateful content against a targeted group of people. However there are various laws and legislation that can be applied when confronting discrimination, such as hate speech. The regulations guaranteeing protection of the human rights against the discrimination are described in detail in Periodic Reports by the Government of Japan under Article 9 of the International Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

When it comes to regulations concerning the content of Article 4 of the ICERD banning the spread of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, the Japanese law does not make hate
speech, which falls into this category, a subject of punishment.\textsuperscript{58} However, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the First and Second Report on International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination introduces the existing laws that can be applied when such activities occur.

If the content damages the honor or credit of a specific individual or group, such dissemination of ideas is punishable as a crime of defamation (Article 230, Penal Code), insult (Article 231), or damage to credit, obstruction of business (Article 233) of the Penal Code. If such activities include threatening contents against a specific individual, they are punishable as a crime of intimidation (Article 222), collective intimidation and habitual intimidation (Article 1 and Article 1-3 of the Law concerning Punishment of Physical Violence and Others).\textsuperscript{59}

Regarding incitement to racial discrimination, it is punishable as a crime of instigation (Article 61 of Penal Code) or as assistance of the crimes (Article 62 of Penal Code).\textsuperscript{60}

Violence against minorities is punishable under the Penal Code concerning riots resulting in violence or threat (Article106), rape (Article 177), homicide (Article 199), and bodily injury (Article 204). Nevertheless there is no specific law punishing violence against a group of people addressed by their collective name, such as Korean.\textsuperscript{61}

The government claims that Japanese Penal Code covers all the objectives of the Article 4; nevertheless the hate speech movement continues escalating. The problematics of the existing laws are that the target of the hate speech has to be specified, meaning that the target of a hate speech has to be addressed by its official name, for instance by stating the name of an individual or the name of a business, in order to make it punishable by law. When the hate speech target is unspecified and the speech addresses the ethnic minority as a whole, which usually is the case, the chances of punishing the instigator of such speech are very low. In order to make discrimination, such as hate speech, punishable establishing new laws banning libel, insult and incitement against the minority groups is required.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{58} "Article 4 [International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination]", Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2015.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., para. 52.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., para. 53.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., para. 54.

\textsuperscript{62} Kotani, p. 392.
4. Discussion

4.1 Freedom of Expression vs. Hate Speech in Contemporary Japan – Governmental Stance

Over most recent years, the escalating discriminatory activities such as hate speech demonstrations and the inadequacies in the existing law concerning regulations that would prevent, ban or punish such activities are starting to get recognized as an important issue. There is an ongoing debate in attempt to establish the legal measures to be carried out when confronting the discrimination issues. Nevertheless, there is one substantial hindrance complicating the process, namely Japan’s desire to unconditionally preserve the Article 21 of the Constitution of Japan protecting the right of freedom of expression. On the state-level the opinions are divided between those who believe that freedom of speech needs to be protected by all means and those who believe that the discriminatory content of the hate speech should be outlawed.

Since it is the ruling party, the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)\(^63\) elected by the Japanese citizens that is the executive organ, in this paper when discussing the governmental stance the focus is primarily put on the LDP. The LDP is the ruling political party in Japan since December 2012 (re-elected in December 2014) with its leader Prime Minister Abe Shinzo. As a matter of fact it is the second time that Abe Shinzo takes on the role of Prime Minister. The first time was between years 2006 and 2007.

The general attitudes of the ruling Japanese government can be noted in the paragraph 84 of International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Report (2013) commenting on the reservations made upon the accession to the convention.

The Government of Japan does not believe that, in present-day Japan, racist thoughts are disseminated and racial discrimination is incited, to the extent that the withdrawal of its reservations or legislation to impose punishment against dissemination of racist thoughts and other acts should be considered even at the risk of unduly stifling legitimate speech.\(^64\)

---

\(^63\) Liberal Democratic Party: 自由民主党 Jiyūminshutō abbreviated to 自民党 Jimintō

Considering the fact that since year 2013 over 360 cases of hate speech demonstrations were observed the statement above is especially worth attention.\textsuperscript{65}

In the Additional Report generated by NGO Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Japan (ERD Net) the problems “Regarding the Police Protection of Racist Groups and Control on Anti-racist Groups” are highlighted.\textsuperscript{66} As it is the state that maintains control over the police force it is relevant to make a brief overview of the actual measures undertaken by the police force during the hate speech demonstrations. The hate speech demonstrators are granted a permission to use the public road and are safeguarded by the police officers, disregarding the fact that they could be arrested for their discriminatory acts to the charges of intimidation, obstruction of business or assault. On the other hand, those who protest against the hate speech demonstrations are considered violators of freedom of expression and as a result of complaints filed by the hate speech demonstrators, they are arrested, searched or prosecuted.\textsuperscript{67}

As one may see even the attitudes of the police show the tendency of prioritizing the right to freedom of expression, regardless the content of such speeches, which complies with the situation described in the demonstration against Korean school in Kyoto where the policemen just stood beside and did not make any efforts in order to end the demonstration. This kind of response by the police force as well as the governmental comments regarding reservations to Article 4 give an impression of hate speech issue being neglected and trivialized by the government. Tessa Morris-Suzuki in her paper “Freedom of Hate Speech; Abe Shinzo and Japan's Public Sphere” argues that in reality it is the government that allows hate speech to happen by policing freedom of speech of the anti-hate speech movements.\textsuperscript{68}

\textbf{4.1.1 Two Surveys on the Governmental Standpoint}

There is a survey called “The distance between the elected party and their base supporters regarding policies” conducted by newspaper Asahi in cooperation with Tokyo University in

\textsuperscript{66} Additional Report Concerning the Issues of Non-recognition of the Right to Public Assistance of Non-citizens, including Permanent Residents (Nationality Clause) and Hate Speech in relation to Article 4-(a) and (b) of the ICERD <http://imadr.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/CERD_85th-session_Japan_ERD-Net_Additional-Report.pdf> [accessed 19 May 2015]
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., p.3.
The aim of the survey is to show the opinion differences between the parties and its electorate regarding different policies. The members of National Diet and their supporters were asked to choose on the scale of one to five what their thoughts regarding hate speech policies were. There one meant that “hate speech should be regulated by law” and five indicated the view that “regardless of pros and cons, one should be cautious of making legal restrictions”. The results revealed that the views of LDP and their supporters were almost identical. The party members as well as its electorate chose number three “it is neither of those” on the scale, meaning that the government is neither against nor for establishing legal regulations concerning hate speech.

The general attitudes of the ruling government are that one should be cautious of legally regulating the hate speech, with regard to the constitutional right of freedom of expression. Here is a list of the most common proclamations: 1) Since it is virtually impossible to establish what content should be perceived as “unpleasant” there is a danger of the government abusing their power and ban the content they perceive as “bad”. 2) The content of hate speech reflects opinions that are related to the internal administration as well as the foreign policies and that is why hate speech should be protected. 3) Since the nature of freedom of expression is very vulnerable and the content of hate speech is ambiguous once attempting to regulate it people will stop to express their thoughts freely in fear of being punished. 4) The solution to the problem is education rather than making legal regulations, which will not change the discriminative views of the people. 5) As freedom of expression is a tool of safety valve banning hate speech might result in even more extreme behaviours. Summarising, the overwhelming majority of those who are against regulating hate speech thinks that the solution is to exchange views and opinions with the opposition through a debate.

The second survey “Emergency survey regarding hate speech among all the members of national Diet” was conducted by NGO Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Japan (ERD Net) in 2012. The respondents were asked the following questions: 1) Do you think

---

69 “Takushita omoi, Giin no zure 託した思い 議員のズレ(Entrusted feelings, a gap between the members of the Diet)”, The Asahi Shimbun.
70 Ibid.
71 Morooka, pp. 147–149.
72 “Heito spiichi ni kan suru zenkokukaigi’in kinnkyū ankēto shūkei kekka 「ヘイトスピーチに関する全国会議員緊急アンケート」集計結果 (Emergency survey regarding hate speech among all the members of national Diet)”, NGO Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Japan (ERD Net), 2012,
that the government should establish countermeasures concerning hate speech? 2) What do you think about the opinion that an investigation regarding the true situation of hate speech should be conducted before creating countermeasures? 3) Do you think that the Diet should make a debate or an investigation regarding discrimination related legislations? The surveys were distributed on three occasions and the NGO got in contact with all the targets of the survey either personally or through a phone call. Despite these efforts, out of 717 target persons only 46 responded and although the LDP has 379 members only three of them answered the survey, making the LDP’s response rate 0.8%. In the case when the percentage of replies is extremely low the answers cannot be taken into consideration. Nevertheless, it may imply that the ruling party is perhaps unconcerned with issues of discriminatory nature. The underlying reasons for the negligence of the related issues from the governmental side will be discussed in more detail when comparing them with the results of my online interview in section 4.2.2, specifically in undersection Hate Speech = Freedom of Expression (pp 32-33).

Although the reasons for remaining cautious in regard of restraining freedom of speech appear rational there must be other underlying motives for this persistence. Especially since most of the developed countries with only one exception for the USA have decided to undertake legal measures constraining hate speech and other forms of discrimination.

4.1.2 Prime Minister Abe

Prime Minister Abe himself as well as his administration has repeatedly been criticised in various research for their nationalistic dogma and the denial of Japan’s history. For instance Gavan McCormack in his short essay “Abe Days Are Here Again: Japan in the World” describes Abe and his politics of 2006-2007 as the most radical of all Japanese post-1945 leaders. He also adds that Abe’s term was marked by denialism of war responsibility and ultra-nationalism exemplified by the instance of historical revisionism of the Japanese history textbooks “so as to make people proud and fill them with patriotic spirit”.

When it comes to addressing the increasing hate speech activities Abe uttered the following opinions: “It is truly regrettable that there are words and actions that target certain
countries and races,” He also added: “I believe that the Japanese respect harmony and should not be people who exclude others. […] The Japanese way of thinking is to behave politely and to be generous and modest at any time”’.\textsuperscript{75} I find this kind of statement made by the Prime Minister describing the national characteristics of the Japanese people appears to be in line with what the nihonjinron is attempting to do. Abe emphasises the “unique” qualities of the Japanese that prevent hate speech from escalating and making it a serious issue, at the same time trivialising the ongoing acts of discrimination, since they are not truly “Japanese”.

4.2 Freedom of Expression vs. Hate Speech in Contemporary Japan – Students’ Outlook

One of the main purposes of this study is, as already stated, to examine the views of Japanese university students concerning the escalating hate speech activities in contemporary Japan. As youth of a country is often considered to be the country’s future it is highly relevant to explore the views and attitudes of Japan’s young generation as it is an indicator of where the country is headed.

There are two main sources, presented in the section “Material and Method” of this paper, and both are of helpful when discussing the attitudes of the students. One of the sources is a quantitative survey with over one thousand participants called “Hate speech and youth — a survey of Koreans in Japan and Japanese University students living in urban centers—”.\textsuperscript{76} The second source is a qualitative online interview created and conducted by me, which serves as a complement to the survey and contributes with some more in-depth insights concerning Japanese students’ attitudes towards hate speech issue. The results of both the quantitative survey study and qualitative online interviews are henceforward presented.

4.2.1 Survey Overview

“Hate speech and youth — a survey of Koreans in Japan and Japanese University students living in urban centers—” was conducted in year 2014 by Izawa Yasuki the professor at the Faculty of Sociology, and a member of the Institute of Human Science at Toyo University, in cooperation with the Organization of United Korean Youth in Japan (KEY). The survey was conducted in


\textsuperscript{76} Izawa, pp. 87–109.
order to clarify what thoughts young Japanese people had concerning hate speech. The subjects of the study were students from different universities in Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Kobe and Fukuoka, 533 of them were females and 463 were males, 18 persons did not respond to the survey which makes the total number of participants 996. The overwhelming majority of the respondents, 939 students, were of Japanese descent. Gender balance and the number of participants as well as the variety of locations of the universities that the participants attend make this survey a highly reliable source of information.

The survey is divided into four different sections: 1) Level of familiarity with Korean residents in Japan 2) Awareness concerning hate speech 3) Awareness about history education 4) Relativeness to social distance discourse. The last section is based on Bogardus social distance scale which is a psychological testing scale created by Emory S. Bogardus. It proves, by asking various questions regarding social closeness, that the social distance towards individuals who have been accepted into one’s “inside group” is shorter than the social distance towards individuals belonging to an “outside group”.\(^\text{77}\)

For the purpose of this study only the relevant parts of each section that assist in answering the research question will be summarised and presented below. Since the aim of this study is not to research the differences between genders or geographical variations, but to examine the general attitudes of Japanese students, divisions of the results according to the gender or the geographical location are disregarded.

**The results of the survey**

In the first section, 1) Level of familiarity with Korean residents in Japan, the participants were first asked whether they were aware of Korean residents existence in Japan, to which 86.7% of participants responded affirmatively. Next they were asked whether they knew the reason why there are Korean residents in Japan, to which 40.4% responded affirmatively. The last question in this section was whether they have a friend or an acquaintance among Korean residents in Japan, and to this question only 30.2% of the participants answered affirmatively. Briefly concluding the results in this section, one realizes that although most of the students are aware of the existence of Korean residents in Japan, less than half knows of the historical and political background that brought the Koreans to Japan. This result may be partially explained by the fact that less than one

\[^{77}\] Izawa, p. 97.
third of the respondents has friends or acquaintances among the Korean residents.

The second section of the study, 2) Awareness concerning hate speech, is most directly relevant to my primary research question. In this section the author asked the respondents whether they had heard of hate speech to which only 35% answered that they had. It is a surprising result concerning the fact that the topic of hate speech is frequently discussed in the media. The participants were asked then, whether they knew the content of the hate speech, to which, 63% of the participants left the question unanswered, one fourth answered that they knew the content and 11.9% answered that they were unaware.

The next question concerned the respondents’ thoughts on hate speech. Again, most of the participants, 73.2%, left this part unanswered. 8.7% thought “it is not good”, 10.5% thought “it definitely has to stop”, 2.8% “it does not matter to me”, 0.8% answered that “it matters little to me” and finally 2.0% said “there are some points I agree with”. This result shows that the vast majority of the 26.8% who answered this question is against hate speech and only 5.6% agree with it or do not find it wrong. One thing that is worth attention is that as well as in the previous question, the vast number of students left this question unanswered. I found this to be similar to the way the politicians responded or rather left unanswered the survey conducted by NGO Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Japan (described in section 4.1.1). This may be an indication of a tendency of escaping or overlooking serious matters can be seen in both social groups.

The next question was enquired after showing the participants the content of hate speech, such as “Go back to Korea”, “Koreans stink of kimchi”, “Comfort women do not exist; there was no forced labour” etc. on the Internet. The respondents were asked what they thought about it. 5.7% said “it makes me angry”, 31.6% answered that “it is unpleasant”, 21% said “it does not matter to me”, 3.3% “sympathise with it”, 0.3% felt “happy” about it, while 11.8% opted for “the other”. The result makes it apparent that although over one third of the participants find the content unpleasant or it even makes them angry, the majority does not have any negative thoughts or feelings about the offensive content of hate speech.

The next section of the study on history education is omitted because it is beyond the scope of this study. The next section of the survey is 4) Relativeness to social distance discourse. This section examines the attitudes of the students towards the Korean residents depending on the term used and the relation between them. The survey uses three different terms of calling the
Korean residents which influences participants’ perception of the same group of people that
Korean residents are. However since it is not the topic of the research these three categories are
disregarded and the results in this section are presented as a whole. There are five questions in
this section that were selected in order to show the degree of the social distance among the
Japanese students towards the Korean residents. The participants had to choose whether they
approve of or they are against the five following statements involving Korean residents:
1. Living in Japan
2. If they want to be your friend
3. If they live next door to you
4. If they travel with you
5. If they get married with one of your siblings or relatives
The results show that the closer the social distance is the negativity threshold becomes more
visible. In the same order the questions were asked the number of respondents who approved
decreased accordingly. While almost 90% of the participants had nothing against Korean
residents living in Japan, the number slowly but steadily decreased to 89.5 % when asked about
becoming friends, and then also when asked about living next door to each other the number who
approved sank to less than 80%. In the case of travelling together the number who approved was
only 77%. Lastly when asked about marriage to one of the relatives the number was the lowest at
roughly 65%. The study makes a point in saying that the degree of tolerance is highly influenced
by the degree of social distance. Most of the students did not have anything against Korean
residents living in Japan or being friends with them, however, when it came to closer interaction
such as being neighbours, travelling together or having a Korean resident become part of their
family by marrying their relative the level of tolerance decreased by roughly one fourth from
90% to only 65%. The result of this survey is not in any way remarkable as the relativeness of
social distance has been proven over and over again in other studies applying Bogardus Social
Distance Scale.

4.2.2 Online Interview
Interview Questions

78 Three different terms used for calling the Korean residents in the survey: 在日コリアン(zainichi korian)
、在日韓国人(zainichi kankokujin) and 在日朝鮮人(zainichi chōsenjin), where the two first terms are neutral and
the last one has a negative connotations as it is often associated with North Korea, in Japanese called Kita Chōsen.
1) Do you have any friends who are foreign residents in Japan?
2) What do you think about the foreign residents in Japan?
3) Have you heard about the hate speech that occurs in Japan? If not please click the link and watch the video of one of the hate speech demonstrations.\textsuperscript{79} Do you know its content? If not please click the link and watch the video of one of the hate speech demonstrations.
4) What do you think about the content of hate speech? Write how you feel about it.
5) Do you think that hate speech is part of freedom of expression? Why? Write your opinion.
6) To what extent does hate speech falls into the freedom of expression category?
7) Read the text concerning Japan’s laws and recent incidents (concerning hate speech), and then write down your thoughts regarding Japan’s current situation and laws.
8) Do you have any suggestions as of how to eliminate hate speech?

Question number three consists of two parts. If the answer in one or both of the parts is negative the participants are asked to watch an example video of a hate speech demonstration taking place in Tokyo in order to familiarise oneself with the content of hate speech and then be able to accurately answer question number four that is asking about their opinions regarding the content of hate speech.

Participants
The participants of this study are twenty Japanese university students between ages 20 and 26. The gender ratio between the participants is 14 males to 6 females. They all come from different parts of Japan and study at established Japanese universities, with one exception for one participant who is a Japanese graduate student at Stockholm University.
To protect the privacy of the interviewees the study uses pseudonyms instead of the real names. There are five pieces of information presented on each of the participants: 1) pseudonym which is used to refer to them in this study, 2) age, 3) place of birth, 4) university name and 5) their major.

1) Taichi, 20, Tokyo, Waseda University, Sport Business

\textsuperscript{79} The link to a three minute video on Youtube of one of the hate speech demonstrations organized by Zaitoku-kai that took place in Tokyo: \textit{Zaitoku-kai ni yoru heito supiichi no rei (hantenren demo kauntā) 在特会によるヘイトスピーチの例（反天連デモカウンター）} [An example of hate speech organised by Zaitoku-kai (Counter demonstration against Anti-Emperor Activities Network)], 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UKY3scP1Md8&feature=youtube_gdata_player> [accessed 9 May 2015].
The Interview Results

The first question is whether the participants have a friend among foreign residents in Japan. The vast majority, exactly 17 of the participants, answered “yes” to that question and only three of them answered “no”.

The participants were then asked what they thought of foreign residents in Japan. The vast majority thought that as long as the person was born or/and is fluent in Japanese they do not notice any difference between foreign residents and Japanese nationals. Even if there were any cultural differences they are not noticeable enough to make any significant difference in their perception of the foreign residents. Many concluded also just like in Kei’s statement that: “Everyone has their own personality. Just like me they [foreign residents] are just humans”.

---

80 Kei
Nevertheless some of the participants, although they have nothing against the foreign residents, do have some negative images of foreign residents in Japan. For instance Keita said that: “There is an image of them [foreign residents] working in the entertainment industry”.  

Anna mentioned also that: “Seen from the society’s perspective they [the foreign residents] do not respect the rules regarding garbage recycling”.

Question number three enquiries the participants about their awareness of the escalating hate speech movements in Japan. First they are asked whether they know of the hate speech occurring in Japan. 14 of the interviewees are aware of the hate speech in Japan and six does not know about this issue. The follow-up question in this section is whether they know the content of such hate speech and this time only four of the interviewed persons answered “yes”, meaning that of the 14 people who are aware of the hate speech issue only four know what this issue actually concerns.

To answer question number seven the respondents were asked to read a passage of text on the laws and current situation in Japan concerning hate speech. A brief summary of the text in English is presented here.

As of year 2015, there are no actual laws regulating hate speech issue in Japan. The freedom of expression is constitutionally protected and the offences that hate speech consists of are punishable with accordance to the Penal Code (the existing laws are described in detail in chapter 3 Japanese “anti-hate speech” laws). Since 2012 there has been a visible deterioration of relations with China and South Korea due to unresolved historical issue among others. Abe administration is also going in the direction of denying the past issues, such as committed war crimes. Since then there have been hate speech demonstrations organised across the nation (over 360 demonstrations in 2013). The targeted groups of these demonstrations are Korean residents in Japan, Chinese, Burakumin, comfort women and all the organisations that offer them support.

After reading the information, the participants were then told to share their thoughts concerning the text. The answers provided differ significantly making it difficult to find a common trait.

---

81 Keita
82 Anna
Some of them are shocked by the fact that there were over 360 demonstrations organised in just one year.\(^8\)\(^3\) Others thought that the international issues should be left to the governments to resolve instead of making civilians the target of their frustrations.\(^8\)\(^4\) Anna thought that “the citizens are not willing to team up and tackle this problem collectively”.\(^8\)\(^5\) According to Kazuya, “Not considering discriminatory acts against an unspecified group a crime is what makes hate speech possible”.\(^8\)\(^6\) Many of the participants already in this question made proposals as of how to solve the hate speech issue, which is further discussed under answers to the question number eight.

Since the aim of this study is to explore Japanese students’ opinions regarding hate speech and comparing it to the governmental stance, the results obtained from question number five are perhaps of most significance to this study. The results revealed students’ attitudes towards hate speech and freedom of expression. In question number five the participants were asked whether they thought that hate speech is to be regarded as part of freedom of expression. Eight of the participants answered that hate speech is to be considered as part of freedom of speech, ten students did not think hate speech should be considered as part of freedom of expression, while two of the participants were unable to decide what is the right approach so they marked both “yes” and “no” answers.

The way the participants answered this question made a clear division between them, creating three separate groups: 1) those who think that hate speech is part of freedom of speech, 2) those who think hate speech does not belong in the same category as freedom of expression and 3) those who think the answer is somewhere in between. For that reason henceforward the results of this study are presented in three groups in accordance with the answer given to question number five of the interview.

**Hate Speech = Freedom of Expression**

In this section the results and answers obtained from the students who consider hate speech as part of freedom of speech are presented. It is interesting to know what other common traits these participants share. While most of them, seven out of eight, do have a foreign resident among their...
friends, only three of them heard about the hate speech issue in Japan, but neither of them knows the content of such hate speech demonstrations, which is worth attention. It actually signifies that while three of the interviewees had a vague idea of what hate speech is, for most of them it was the first time they encountered this issue. Meaning perhaps that after watching one video of the hate speech demonstration, they do not possess sufficient information allowing them to make an elaborate and nuanced judgment.

The responses to the follow-up question under question number five, which simply examines why the participants answered the way they did, are helpful in understanding why they consider hate speech part of freedom of expression. The leading thought in all their answers is similarly to the government’s standpoint the basic right of freedom of speech that is guaranteed by the constitution. All the citizens have the right to publicly express their thoughts and opinions, meaning that even hateful and inciting content should be protected by this basic right. Taku expressed his concerns saying: “The freedom of expression is originally created as a tool to make comments and express criticism. /…/ On the contrary, when thinking of hate speech being strictly controlled it is rather a threat [to freedom of expression]”.\textsuperscript{87} Risa also showed similar concerns: “Criticism is part of freedom of expression. If we did not have the right to freedom of expression, then we would not be permitted to express the criticism against the country”.\textsuperscript{88} Another opinion expressed by Keita that somewhat trivialised the implication of hate speech: “I think that it must be remembered that it [hate speech] is just some swear words following as an extension of the opinions they have”.\textsuperscript{89}

It is clear to see that the students in this group are more concerned about protecting the basic rights of every citizen which freedom of expression is, disregarding the actual content and the harmful effect hate speech may have on the targeted group of people, which is very similar to the governmental views. For that reason it is interesting to understand the individual’s perception toward the content of such hate speech. The answer is provided through question number four. All of the comments provided differ, but the general attitudes towards hate speech remain the same. None of the participants found the content of hate speech pleasant or amusing, and most of them thought it is racist and harmful to the targets of such demonstrations. Here are some comments and observations worth mentioning. Naoki thought that: “They [participants of hate

\textsuperscript{87} Taku \\
\textsuperscript{88} Risa \\
\textsuperscript{89} Keita
speech demonstrations] just want to show their existence in the society by making the radical speeches and manifestations”. Taichi said: “When you look at it [hate speech demonstration] from the perspective of freedom of speech you cannot oppose it”. Rena commented that: “Hate speech is the prime example of Japanese people’s stupidity”.

Question number six asks the participants to what extent hate speech should be considered as freedom of speech. Most of the participants in this group thought that since hate speech is part of freedom of expression, anyone should be allowed to express any opinion they have, but at the same time if the content has negative effects on others, and causes social disturbance and chaos, it should be regulated by law. Only one of the participant thought that the whole content of hate speech should be allowed.

In the last question of the interview the participants were asked to think of solutions that would help eliminating the hate speech issue. Three of the respondents thought that the key to resolving this issue is education. Naoki said, “In order to resolve this problem, the only way is to teach out the importance of multiculturalism with help of the educational institutions”. Rena thought that, “If the countries could resolve their international issues and get on good terms, the hate speech issue would also disappear”. Keita said that the solution is to consider the content of hate speech as human rights violation and establish legal regulations. Nevertheless, that said half of the participants in this group thought that it is unrealistic to eliminate hate speech completely.

The group of participants who regards hate speech as part of freedom of speech has very similar views to the governmental stance. They are sceptical to the concept of banning hate speech and are concerned about the consequences of such regulations. Their main concern is that by making legislations the nationals will be stripped of their constitutional right of freedom of expression. Similarly to the governmental stand point they do not fully acknowledge that hate speech may be harmful to its target. In my opinion it is not the result of racist views or
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disapproval of affected minorities, but it seems to be an indication of oblivion to discriminatory acts in the society. Precisely as Abe expressed in his statement there is a deep disbelief in regard of Japanese people being capable of such behaviour.

Another explanation is related to what I have previously discussed in section 1.2.2 concerning the Japanese people being still convinced of the ethnical and cultural homogeneity, often expressed as tan’itsu minzoku. The notion of tan’itsu minzoku often can be found in nihonjinron literature.\textsuperscript{99} “Tan’itsu means ‘one’ or ‘uni’, but minzoku is a multi-vocal term which, reflecting the Japanese situation, means not only race but ethnic community and nation”.\textsuperscript{100} As the result there is a lack of adequate attention given to the presence of minorities, such as \textit{zainichi}-Koreans. I believe that the lack of sufficient acknowledgment can explain the fact why the issues of the minorities are disregarded both by the politicians and the young.

\textbf{Hate Speech ≠ Freedom of Expression}

Here are presented the answers and the general attitudes of the participants who think that hate speech should not be considered freedom of expression. In this group eight out of ten respondents has a friend among foreign residents in Japan. In contrast to the previous group where only three out of eight participants are aware of the hate speech issue the number in this group is nine out of ten. Whereas in the previous group no one is aware of the content of such hate speech, in this group three out of ten participants know the content. This result indicates that since it is not the first time that most of the participants heard of the hate speech issue they probably have more background knowledge and are therefore capable of forming their opinions.

Regarding the responses to the follow-up question asking them to explain why they think hate speech should not be considered freedom of speech all of the participant were unanimous saying that the content that is harmful and hurtful to others should not be allowed as it is a form of discrimination and is depriving the target group of their human rights. Shun explained, “Freedom of expression is not to allow everything and the content that is degrading and unpleasant to others should be regulated by law. I think morally and legally such content should not be freely expressed, especially if it is fundamentally negating the specific identity that is

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[99] Yoshino, p. 25.
\item[100] Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
composed of race, culture or nationality”. Kei also mentioned, “The methods of expression are too violent. Even if the content is only words, the violence should not be accepted”. Gentaro pointed out that, “It [the hate speech] only expressed one’s own hatred, and a speech that is attempting to humiliate others is useless and harmful”. This group of participants in contrast to the previous group is much more concerned with the harms that the content of hate speech might bring to its target than the constitutional right to freedom of expression. They consider hate speech to be discriminative and depriving the target of such act of their basic human rights and dignity.

When it comes to question number four commenting on the content of hate speech the views of the participants in the previous group and in this group are similar. The respondents find the content discriminative and harmful to its target. Kazuya said, “They are just expressing they hatred and do not really say what the problem is”. Shun commented, “I think that in every country there are people who would dislike foreigners, but statements that generalise saying ‘because he is Korean’ are not good, as well as using words such as ‘Die’ to insult someone is immoral”.

The attitudes towards question number six similarly to the previous group show the reluctance towards the discrimination encompassed in the content of hate speech. However since the participants in this group do not consider hate speech to be part of freedom of expression they focus more on establishing the framework for what is permissible. For instance Kei answered, “The content should be expressed with respect for others, based on the facts and without violence”. Haruki expressed his opinion saying, “If you restrict all the content [of the hate speech] the risk is you will not be able to say anything, which is why it is important to find balance”.

When it comes to the solutions concerning elimination of the hate speech issue the majority of the participants suggested that there is a need of establishing laws regulating such demonstrations. Kaori said, “I don’t have any proposal, but I hope the laws protecting human
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rights of the minorities will be established soon”. Kenta also mentioned that a good solution would be severe restrictions achieved by making changes to the existing law. Some other respondents thought just like in the preceding group that raising the awareness of issues such as discrimination and hate speech could be the solution. For instance by reinforcing establishment of international exchange programs for the youth and making sure that the history especially of the East Asia is correctly interpreted. Kei also pointed out the importance of understanding and resolving the underlying issues that cause the hate speech demonstration and try to resolve the source of their dismay.

The views of the participants in this group are noticeably more liberal in comparison to the ruling party’s standpoint. They show more concern for the affected individuals and minorities instead of emphasising the importance of freedom of expression. I would argue that this group of students is has more nuanced views, also considering the fact that 90% of them had previous knowledge of the issue. The participants do not seem to believe that Japanese are a unique and homogenous nation the way it is manifested and proclaimed endlessly in writings on nihonjinron. In my opinion they are less affected by this traditional way of regarding Japan and “Japaneseness” and therefore have more varied opinions regarding the hate speech issue.

**Hate Speech: Freedom of Expression?**
Lastly, it is time to examine the views of the two participants who were unable to decide whether hate speech should be considered freedom of expression or not. The reason why Akira was undecided is that he thought “It depends on the definition of hate speech”. In the case of Takashi the reason was that, “Hate speech is also a sort of freedom of expression and that’s why it is interpreted as the constitutional right, but even one of the most important rights such as freedom of speech is not an unconditional freedom, but should be restricted in order to guarantee common wellbeing”.

When it comes to the content of such hate speech, in response to the question number four both participants thought it is wrong, but with focus on different aspects. Akira said that the
arguments of Zaitoku-kai were unwarranted and that their discriminative and insulting actions should not be allowed.\textsuperscript{116} Takashi thought that the hateful content of the demonstration was disruptive to establishing peaceful relations between Japan, South Korea and Japan and that it also had bad effect on the economy.\textsuperscript{117}

As answer to question number six Akira said that, “Although making speeches is guaranteed by the right to freedom of expression, it doesn’t mean that it should be allowed to make hate speech against the most vulnerable group that foreigners are.”\textsuperscript{118} On the other hand Takashi believes that to make a correct judgment you need to take into the consideration the effects of hate speech, its content, and also the place. If it has bad influence on the society it should not be allowed. However if the hatred against the Koreans is a personal opinion expressing this hatred should be guaranteed by freedom of speech.\textsuperscript{119}

What are the solutions they proposed? Akira said that since in the time of globalization it is almost impossible to eliminate hate speech and the fact that defining what hate is make it even more difficult. That is why there is no room for shortcuts and the only way for hate speech to decline is to create as equal society as possible.\textsuperscript{120} According to Takashi the best solution for eliminating or decreasing hate speech is to enable everyone an opportunity to familiarise oneself with the foreign residents by organising exchange meetings. The best way to achieve this goal is through educational institutions, since everyone has to go through compulsory education. By doing so everyone gets a chance to meet the real people leading to the establishment of mutual understanding.

5 Conclusions

By analysing and comparing the views and statements of both the ruling party and the university students I was able to answer both of the research questions of my study, namely: \textit{How does the Japanese students’ outlook on the hate speech issue compare to the governmental stance?} As well as: \textit{What are the underlying reasons for the views of the Japanese students and the ruling party?}

\textsuperscript{116} Akira
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\textsuperscript{118} Akira
\textsuperscript{119} Takashi
\textsuperscript{120} Akira
Considering the fact that the young population and the government are very distinct social groups it was not an easy task to make a viable comparison between the two. However, to my surprise the two groups actually did have some common traits which made this study possible. For one, the two surveys conducted among the political parties and the survey conducted among the university students revealed that many of the respondents in my view seem to be oblivious to the issue of hate speech. What I perceived as indifference towards discrimination against minorities was further emphasised by the high non-response ratio among the participants of both groups. As I have already explained I ascribe this “indifference” to the fact that many Japanese partially affected by the nihonjinron and its writings still believe that Japan is a uni-cultural and uni-ethnic country. Which in its turn is indicates to them that the act of ethnic discrimination that hate speech is, does not affect many, as in their opinion the number of the non-citizens in Japan is limited. Nevertheless, the reality is different since the actual number of non-citizens and the ethnical minorities exceeds two million people.

Another similarity I noted when comparing the governmental stance and the results of my online interviews is the concerns expressed regarding banning hate speech. Both the government and the students in the group which considered hate speech part of freedom of expression regarded making legislations against hate speech not only problematic but also violating the basic constitutional rights as well as a threat against the democratic values.

Based on my research I tend to interpret this reluctance towards banning hate speech as something being mostly caused by the deeply embedded notion of the Japanese being a unique nation, described in nihonjinron theories. I do not believe that the Japanese are a racist nation, since the surveys presented in this study show that most of the people actually disapprove of hate speech. What I consider to be the actual issue here is the deeply embedded belief of Japan being a unique and homogenous country among the Japanese nationals, where the issue of ethnical discrimination has no place as there are not many foreigners residing in Japan. In accordance with the way Benedict Anderson makes the distinction between racism and nationalism, the beliefs the Japanese people share originate in ideologies of nation, discussed in the nihonjinron, which are nationalistic rather than racist.\textsuperscript{121}

My study has shown that even a great deal of educated people, such as the university students and the politicians seem to be unaware of the issue at hand, making it difficult to tackle. Nevertheless, according to my research and interview results there are many people who might be less affected by the nationalistic theories based upon *nihonjinron*, thus in my view seem to have a more wholesome view of the situation. One of the reasons for exploring the views of the educated youth was the fact that they are the future of their country. Although there are still many students who seem to be unaware of the discrimination against the minorities in Japan, according to my research there actually are many other students who are deeply concerned with the issue, which brings hope for Japan being a discrimination- and hate speech free country in the future.

The scope of this paper did limit the potential research that could be made in the field of discrimination and hate speech issue in Japan and there are still many questions unanswered; indicating that further research is in place.

Since my field of study includes both Japan and China, my future objective is to conduct a more comprehensive research concerning the discrimination, by comparing views of the citizens in both countries. This future research topic is worth exploring, especially considering the fact that with Japan’s aging population and low rate birth, the country will soon need to open its borders to foreign labour force. I believe that with increased number of immigrants coming from neighbouring countries, such as China, exploring views of such immigrants and the Japanese nationals is of certain value. Understanding the views of both sides may contribute in making the integration process smoother, which in its turn may result in the decrease of discrimination against minorities.

**Summary**

This paper discusses views and outlooks of both Japanese university students and the Japanese government concerning the escalating hate speech movement in Japan. The objective of this paper is to compare the views of aforementioned subjects and present the similarities and dissimilarities between them. The secondary objective of my research is to analyse the underlying reasons for the outlook the students as well as the government have on the hate speech issue.

My research paper consists of five sections: 1 Introduction, 2 Theory, Methods and Material, 3 Background Overview, 4 Discussion and 5 Conclusions.
In Introduction I first discuss the personal reasons of how I got interested in my research topic. I then present the definitions for key terms of this paper, which are “hate speech” and “minority”.

In the next section I go on and introduce the theories I apply in my paper. The first theory by Benedict Anderson shows the differences between racism and nationalism. While the other theory I refer to is cultural nationalism on the background of *nihonjinron* described in Yoshino Kosaku’s sociological enquiry. There are various materials used in this study such as published works, newspaper articles, and surveys and also an interview conducted by me. I analyse these texts in Discussion section by applying the aforementioned theories in order to obtain a better insight.

In Background Overview section I first introduce the prominent organization spreading hate speech in Japan, called Zaitoku-kai. I refer to the research conducted by Ito Kenichiro concerning Zaitoku-kai’s motives and members. I also describe an actual example of hate speech demonstration against a Korean school in Kyoto, which I summarise from Yasuda Koichi’s book. In order to get a wider picture of the hate speech issue I also introduce the key international laws aimed at tackling the hate speech issue. Moreover, I discuss Japanese Constitution and the conflicts it causes in application of international laws to Japan’s legal system.

After analysing all the materials I present the conclusions drawn from my research. The comparison made between the views of the Japanese students and the government shows that there are many similarities between these two distinct social groups. I conclude that some of the views they share might be a result of their belief in the theories discussed in *nihonjinron*. However this tendency begins to shift which can be seen in the changing attitudes of the young generation presented in my paper.
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The original interview questions sent to Japanese university students through Facebook

氏名：
ふりがな：
年齢：
出身地：
大学名：
専攻：

日本におけるヘイトスピーチ（憎悪表現）に関する大学生・大学院生の意識についてのオンラインインタビュー

（「はい」と「いいえ」の場合は答えにこの＊印を付けて下さい、例　＊「はい」）

「回答」のところに考えていることを自由に記入して下さい。

1. 在日外国人の友達がいますか。
   「はい」　　「いいえ」

2. 在日外国人のことをどうと思いますか。
   （例：日本人と違うところ；友達か恋人として認められるかどうかなど）

回答：

3. 日本におけるヘイトスピーチについて知っていますか。
   「いいえ」→ 下のビデオを見てください
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aXah7d40GLA　（3分程度）
   「はい」→ ヘイトスピーチのデモを見たことがありますか。
   「はい」　　「いいえ」→ 下のビデオを見てください。
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aXah7d40GLA　（3分程度）

4. ヘイトスピーチの内容についてどう思いますか。感想を書いて下さい。
回答：

5. ヘイトスピーチは表現の自由の範囲として認められると思いますか。
「はい」 「いいえ」
なぜですか。意見を書いて下さい。

回答：

6. ヘイトスピーチは表現の自由としてどの程度まで認められるべきですか。

回答：

7. 日本の現状と法律について、以下の法律と実際に近年起こっている事例に関する文章を読んであなたの考えを述べて下さい。

2015年現在、日本では、ヘイトスピーチ自体を取り締まる一般法、特別法、条例は制定されていないが、民法上の不法行為などに問われる。民法709条、民法1条（信義則）や民法90条（公序良俗）の判断基準として憲法14条や人種差別撤廃条約、自由権規約の趣旨を考慮するのが判例の立場である（私人間効力における間接適用説）。
差別・人権侵害的言論を規制する意図を背景に、人権擁護法案等で諸々の検討がなされているが、言論の自由の侵害の危険性、国家による言論統制の危険性、世論やメディアの行き過ぎた「自己検閲」の危険性[2]など、法案の合憲性、内容や運用方法、制度の必要性や危険性などを巡って議論となっている。日本国憲法第21条では表現の自由が保証されており、ヘイトスピーチについては米国とともに国際的に規制のゆるやかな地域となっている。
また、日本の刑法では「特定人物や特定団体に対する偏見に基づく差別的言動」は侮辱罪や名誉損失罪の対象であり、差別的言動の被害が具体的になれば、事例によっては脅迫罪や業務妨害罪の対象となるが、特定しきれない漠然とした集団（民族・国籍・宗教・性的指向等）に対するものについては、侮辱罪や名誉損失罪には該当しない。
2012年前後から、韓国及び中国との間で領土問題が悪化し、政府・マスコミが両国への批判を行い、反韓国・中国感情が悪化した。また、2012年12月には安倍政権が成立し、すぐに朝鮮学校を高校無償化制度から排除し、また、植民地支配や侵略戦争の責任をあいまいにする方針を打ち出した。それ以降、排外主義デモの数は増加し、毎週末、東京、大阪、神戸、京都、川崎、札幌など各地で行うようになった。2013年9月に結成された「ヘイト・スピーチとレイシズムとたたかうのりこえねっと」（在日コリアン女性活動家、元首相、弁護士、研究者、作家、アイヌ人団体代表など21人の共同代表、事務所は東京都新宿区新大久保）が、インターネット上に記録があるレイシズム関係のデモと街宣の数を調査した。その結果、2013年の1年間で360件以上にのぼると報告されている。
レイシスト団体のターゲットは在日韓国・朝鮮人のほか、中国人、被差別部落民、移住労働者とその家族、日本軍「慰安婦」、これらのマイノリティを支援したり採用したりする企業、組合、団体、個人などに及ぶ。122

回答：

8. ヘイトスピーチを無くすための解決策として何か提案はありますか。

回答：

ご協力ありがとうございました。

122 ‘日本のヘイトスピーチ’、Wikipedia、2015、
<https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%97%A5%E6%9C%AC%E3%81%AE%E3%83%98%E3%82%A4%E3%83%88%E3%82%B9%E3%83%94%E3%83%BC%E3%83%81> [accessed 10 March 2015].