

Chapter 1 : Censorship in Islamic societies - WikiVisually

Islamic teachings and argument have been used to censor opinions and writings throughout history, up to and including the modern era, and thus there are many cases of censorship in Islamic societies.

Censorship in India Save In general, censorship in India, which involves the suppression of speech or other public communication, raises issues of freedom of speech , which is protected by the Indian constitution. The Constitution of India guarantees freedom of expression but places certain restrictions on content, with a view towards maintaining communal and religious harmony, given the history of communal tension in the nation. The rating scale runs from 1 most free to 7 least free. Pornographic magazines are technically illegal, but many softcore Indian publications are available through many news vendors, who often stock them at the bottom of a stack of non-pornographic magazines, and make them available on request. Most non-Indian publications including Playboy are usually harder to find, whether softcore or hardcore. Mailing pornographic magazines to India from a country where they are legal is also illegal in India. In practice, the magazines are almost always confiscated by Customs and entered as evidence of law-breaking, which then undergoes detailed scrutiny. National security The Official Secrets Act is used for the protection of official information, mainly related to national security. The Freedom Of Speech, mandated by the constitution guarantees and safeguards the freedom of press. However, the freedom of press was not always as robust as today. In , the Indira Gandhi government imposed censorship of press during The Emergency. It was removed at the end of emergency rule in March Ruth, father of L. Bertie, brother of Faith, Hope and Justica expired on 26 June". Journalists have decried this as a clampdown on freedom of expression and democracy in Kashmir, as a part of the massive media censorship of the unrest undertaken by the central government. Working journalists protested the ban by marching to the Directorate of Information and Public Relations while the Kashmir Editors Guild KEG held an emergency meeting in Srinagar, thereafter asking the government to revoke the ban immediately, and asking for the intervention of the Press Council of India. Most of the major Kashmiri dailies have also rallied behind the KR, while claiming that the move represented a political vendetta against the newspaper for reporting events in the unrest as they happened on the ground. Hurriyat leaders, known to champion the cause of Kashmiri independence, also recorded their protests against the banning of the newspaper. Amnesty International released a statement saying that "the government has a duty to respect the freedom of the press, and the right of people to receive information,"[14] while criticising the government for shutting down a newspaper for opposing it. On 28 December , the newspaper resumed publication after the government lifted the ban after nearly three months. The combination of act and speech, sight and sound in semi darkness of the theatre with elimination of all distracting ideas will have a strong impact on the minds of the viewers and can affect emotions. Therefore, it has as much potential for evil as it has for good and has an equal potential to instill or cultivate violent or bad behaviour. It cannot be equated with other modes of communication. The censor board cited that the film was "vulgar and offensive". The filmmaker appealed twice again unsuccessfully. The film still remains banned in India, but has screened at numerous festivals all over the world and won awards. The critics have applauded it for its "sensitive and touching portrayal of marginalised community". The censor board justified the ban, saying it was "highly provocative and may trigger off unrest and communal violence". The ban was lifted in October after a sustained campaign. The producers and the director David Fincher finally decided not to release the film in India. The directors refused to make any changes whatsoever to the film and hence the film was denied a certificate. The film, which depicted a structural drug problem in the state of Punjab, used a lot of expletives and showed scenes of drug use. The CBFC, on 9 June , released a list of 94 cuts and 13 pointers, including the deletion of names of cities in Punjab. On 13 June, the film was cleared by the Bombay High Court with one cut and disclaimers. The court ruled that, contrary to the claims of the CBFC, the film was not out to "malign" the state of Punjab, and that it "wants to save people". The quality of the copy, along with the fact that there was supposedly a watermark that said "censor" on top of the screen, raised suspicions that the CBFC itself had leaked the copy to spite the filmmakers. It also contained the only scene that had been cut according to the High Court order.

While the CBFC claimed innocence,[36] the lingering suspicions resulted in a tense release, with the filmmakers and countless freedom of expression advocates taking to social media to appeal to the public to watch the film in theatres, as a conscious challenge against excessive censorship on art in India. In , the film *Lipstick Under My Burkha* directed by Alankrita Shrivastava and produced by Prakash Jha , also ran into trouble with the Central Board of Film Certification refused to certify the film, stating that "The story is lady oriented, their fantasy above life. There are contagious [sic] sexual scenes, abusive words, audio pornography and a bit sensitive touch about one particular section of society. The film will be released with an "A" or adults certificate, equivalent to an NC rating in the United States , with some voluntary edits. Shrivastava told Agence-France Presse: I feel that we will be able to release the film without hampering the narrative or diluting its essence. Singh Chief Justice , S. Chandrachud allowed the writ petition and declared the notification to be ultra vires and illegal, thus rescinding the ban. The play however, has played successfully in many other parts of the country since A Hindi version of the play has been performing since Maps In , it was criminalised in India to question the territorial integrity of frontiers of India in a manner which is, or is likely to be, prejudicial to the interests of the safety or security of India. The subsequent governments have not revoked the ban. It was said that the granth had copied a number of portions from the Guru Granth Sahib. In one of the photographs it showed Baba Bhaniara , wearing a shining coat and headdress in a style similar to that made familiar through the popular posters of Guru Gobind Singh, the tenth guru of the Sikhs. The ban was lifted in November Its Obstacles to Access was rated 12 scale , Limits on Content was rated 10 scale and Violations of User Rights was rated 18 scale. India has a score of 39 on a scale from 0 most free to least free , which places India 20 out of the 47 countries worldwide that were included in the report. India ranked 14 out of 37 countries in the report. India ranks third out of the eleven countries in Asia included in the report. Prior to , censorship of Internet content by the Indian government was relatively rare and sporadic. While there is no sustained government policy or strategy to block access to Internet content on a large scale, measures for removing certain content from the web, sometimes for fear they could incite violence, have become more common. Pressure on private companies to remove information that is perceived to endanger public order or national security has increased since late , with the implementation of the amended ITA. Internet users have sporadically faced prosecution for online postings, and private companies hosting the content are obliged by law to hand over user information to the authorities. In , the Supreme Court ruled that bloggers and moderators can face libel suits and even criminal prosecution for comments posted on their websites. Prior judicial approval for communications interception is not required and both central and state governments have the power to issue directives on interception, monitoring, and decryption. All licensed ISPs are obliged by law to sign an agreement that allows Indian government authorities to access user data. The selective censorship of Web sites and blogs since , made even more disjointed by the non-uniform responses of Internet service providers ISPs , has inspired a clamour of opposition. Clearly government regulation and implementation of filtering are still evolving. Government attempts at filtering have not been entirely effective, as blocked content has quickly migrated to other Web sites and users have found ways to circumvent filtering. The government has also been criticised for a poor understanding of the technical feasibility of censorship and for haphazardly choosing which Web sites to block. The amended IT Act, absolving intermediaries from being responsible for third-party created content, could signal stronger government monitoring in the future.

Chapter 2 : Censorship in Islamic Societies | Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism

copyright in islamic societies Once a hope for democracy, Myanmar is now a study in how it fails Citizens select their leaders, but without the robust institutions or norms like pluralism, universal rights or tolerance necessary for democracy to function.

Retrieved 30 July Before we even begin to talk about whether that belongs in this article or in another article, please find a reliable source, not a joke source. As well, I have again removed the material you restored which is not censorship and so on. This article is not a WP: The way to convince people that this is a legitimate article is to add good material, not to restore rubbish that other users have done the work of removing. Especially WikiIslam as has been discussed before in the reliable sources section. Scholarly sources would be adequate. My very best wishes talk Scholarly sources would be better. If you are in doubt, please ask at RS noticeboard. Can you please explain why each is not appropriate? Please remember, there is no requirement in Wikipedia that only scholarly sources may be used. I removed material that was not censorship. You are not being censored every time a Muslim disagrees with something you say. Censorship entails some entity with the authority to do the censoring - protests, threats, and even murder do not constitute censorship. For example, what is the basis for removing this: The Sudanese teddy bear blasphemy case ; the arrest, trial, conviction, and imprisonment of a British schoolteacher in Sudan in , for allegedly insulting Islam by allowing her class to name a teddy bear "Muhammad" Clearly government action. I thought it was obvious, but your recent comments are making me think that it is necessary to state explicitly not only that censorship entails the existence of an authoritative body doing the censoring, but also of censoring actually happening. As a second point, prior restraint, something that chills free speech by governmental action, such as by religious or "thought" police is also a form of censorship. If needed, I can produce plenty of articles from both legal and academic journals that are directly on point. Is the name "Muhammad" being censored? It specifically discusses the use of defamation of religion laws to censor minority religious views, among other issues. Who said it was not censorship? According to most common definition see censorship , "Censorship is the suppression of speech or other public communication which may be considered objectionable, harmful, sensitive, or inconvenient as determined by a government, media outlet, or other controlling body. It can be done by governments and private organizations or by individuals who engage in self-censorship. This is not necessarily government. Of course killing or putting people in prison simply for telling something which would be nothing special in any western society but was condemned as offense to Islam or Mohammed belongs here. And it was described accordingly in sources, like here. If so, I would revisit and improve it later. You voted to keep the article, but now you seem to be trying to get others to delete it, by adding more and more irrelevant rubbish and refusing to gain consensus. Yes, I voted to keep article. Was that a problem? How am I "refusing to gain consensus"? It should not be included. What content was suppressed by the authorities here? Please do not modify it. Subsequent comments should be made in a new section. We request that editors comment on the following issues: Use of solely academic sources[edit] There is a clear consensus, that the solely use of academic sources is not required. Armbrust The Homonculus Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page. No further edits should be made to this discussion. The use of solely academic sources is not required. Wikipedia policy only requires the use of reliable sources. This is according to WP: RS, one of "five pillars". Living in multicultural and fairly peaceful Leicester , I note the successful use of an academic study of gypsies by 5 local authorities which allowed proper discussion, previously deemed racist to take place. I also note difficulties with the English Defence League article. RS, and simple sense, warns that they are rarely reliable sources for matters of fact. An article does not need to explicitly use the word "censorship" in order to be useful as a source, so long as the meaning is clear from the context of the article. There is absolutely no such requirement for any articles. The article includes a lot of materials that are directly related to the subject and necessary to explain the concept, but probably do not mention word "censorship" IP blocking, DNS filtering, etc. By the same token, one can use here sources that provide background information on Islam, Shariah Law , Islamic revolution in Iran, and so on, whatever needed to

create good article. However, GregJackP is clearly hoping that enough support here will get him around the requirement that sources demonstrate any relevance at all, and so I must oppose. On sources that raise questions, it is simple to go to the talk page for discussion and consensus. Censorship can be accurately described but not named. The word does not have to appear in a source. Are you saying that the word "censorship" does or does not have to appear in the source? My position is always that an intelligent reader can easily discern whether a source discusses the topic or not. I support the wording above: I take a very dim view, however, on tangential and peripheral sources brought in to co-track a topic, or to create a synthesis of views. The source, in this case, should be discussing Islamic censorship, not something else. Censorship in Islamic societies. Darkness Shines talk An intelligent reader can easily discern whether a source discusses the topic or not. Definition of censorship[edit] There is rough consensus for the following definition: It can be done by governments and private organizations. The definition already in place in the Censorship article should be used. This seems to be consistent with sources in our article censorship. If anyone can provide a better definition based on sources, that would be fine too. Sound in theory, but this RFC is being called because GregJackP and MVBM want to claim that the actions of private individuals or other things that are not a "controlling body" against other private individuals constitute censorship, and that is not right. There are nutters in every society. I can see your point on private individuals and have struck that from the proposal. Just for information, the definition used here was pulled directly from the censorship article. The Islamic censorship is special because it comes from Islamic law. However, it will also have a lot of similarities with any other censorship, and it will include self-censorship as a part of the subject. Having certain similarities does not mean that Islamic censorship is not a well defined independent subject. If so, may I ask what we would need to change, so that we can come up with a workable definition? Perhaps "private organizations acting at the behest or with the approval of government? We accept definitions used by reliable sources. If the source describes a situation as one of censorship then it is allowable. You are allowed to use common sense here. The fact that private organization engage in censorship, based on various concerns related to Islam, is important to note in the article. Amended definition of censorship[edit] No consensus. Revised definition per conversation above: It can be done by governments and private organizations acting at the behest or with the approval of government. Censorship can come from non-government sources. Also "private organizations acting at the behest or with the approval of government. If a media outlet decides not to run a story, that is an editorial decision, regardless of the reason. Making editorial decisions and self-censorship by the media at the behest of Government, OK as censorship; decision not to run a story because it might offend, not OK as Censorship in Islamic Societies. The above discussion is closed. Removing more irrelevant material[edit] This article is not List of times Muslims assassinated or attacked people, and also every way in which religion forms part of the state apparatus, and also the times when political censorship took place in a Muslim-majority society. Please wait for a day or so and let them respond before removing sourced materials from the article. At this point, I would rather wait and see what other people think before responding here in detail. Thanks, My very best wishes talk As the editor adding the material, it is in fact your job to demonstrate that it merits inclusion. I wish you good luck with improving this article. Please do not remove sourced material that is subject to a content dispute until: You were Bold and removed sourced material.

Chapter 3 : Censorship in Islamic societies - Wikipedia

This is the talk page for discussing improvements to the Censorship in Islamic societies article. This is not a forum for general discussion of the article's subject.: Put new text under old text.

Censorship in Tunisia Save Censorship in Tunisia has been an issue since the country gained independence in 1956. Though considered relatively mild under President Habib Bourguiba , censorship and other forms of repression became common under his successor, President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali November 7, 2011. However, the Tunisia Monitoring Group reports that the situation with respect to censorship has improved dramatically since the overthrow of Ben Ali in early 2011. Legal provisions Article 8 of the Tunisian Constitution states "the liberties of opinion, expression, the press, publication, assembly, and association are guaranteed and exercised within the conditions defined by the law. Books The Press Code requires a receipt from the Ministry of the Interior before distributing books in the country. Islam and human rights are two frequent points of contention. The League of Free Writers believes that 40 books were censored in the decade 2000-2010. Tunisia has public libraries, which include a regional branch for each of the 23 regions and a National Library in Tunis. It is estimated that 100 new titles for adults are published each year. The National Library has depository rights to four copies of each work published in the country. Newspapers All major newspapers essentially follow the government line and tend to report uncritically on the activities of the President. Radio There is a small number of private radio stations, but they do not independently report news. A permit is required to establish a radio station. Electoral endorsements of candidates are not permitted in the private media. Internet Internet censorship in Tunisia significantly decreased in January 2011, following the ouster of President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali , as the new acting government: Some Internet censorship reemerged when in May 2011. Cyber dissidents including pro-democracy lawyer Mohammed Abbou were jailed by the Tunisian government for their online activities. The Associated Press described the severity of the sentence as having "shocked many Tunisians" and as "a sign of the new importance of Islam in Tunisia". Amnesty International designated Abcha, Beji, and Mejri as prisoners of conscience. He was sentenced to one year in prison in January after his newspaper called for reform of the military justice system. In August he was given a much harsher year sentence by a military court for insurrection and membership in an illegal organisation. He was tried with other suspected An-Nahda members or sympathisers. The trials were heavily criticised by foreign human rights monitoring groups. Hamadi Jebali remained in prison until 2011 and Jebali was considered a prisoner of conscience by Amnesty International. For her work in advancing human rights and press freedom, she was shortlisted for the Sakharov Prize in 2011 and was awarded an International Press Freedom Award from Canadian Journalists for Free Expression in 2011. She filed a request with the government to publish the magazine Kalima in 2011 and did not receive a response. An editorial in the newspaper As-Shouruq charged her with "selling her conscience. These and similar notions, widely regarded abroad as spurious and insulting, have led censorship experts such as Rohan Jayasekera to hail Bensedrine as "a friend to media freedom. The government has had mixed success in blocking the electronic version. PCOT is described by its co-thinkers in France as "constituting the most important opposition force" in Tunisia. Hammami was arrested and sentenced to over four years in prison for contempt of court, and reports that he was "savagely tortured. He was released in June but continued to serve five years of "administrative control" in a remote desert town in southern Tunisia. He was again released in September 2011. The site itself was often censored, access to it could be difficult if at all possible, and though he used a pseudo, Yahyaoui himself was tracked down and arrested for creating the site. Imprisoned for a few years in the Borj al Amri prison, there were numerous campaigns for his release he was sentenced to a couple of years. Shortly after being released he died of a heart attack on March 13, 2011. He was severely tortured and developed several health problems in prison. The TNA was expelled in June following an investigation into press freedom. See also Human rights in Tunisia References.

Chapter 4 : Censorship in India | Revolv

This concise history of Islamic censorship examines the turbulent question of freedom of expression in Islamic societies. The book ranges from the ancient Arabians, to Muhammad's charter offering freedom of expression to Muslims, to modern history, when control of communication shifted to the secularists.

You can help by adding to it. October This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. Examples of Muslim censorship: Depictions of Muhammad have inspired considerable controversy and censorship in the s, including the adjacent image. In Judaism[edit] Throughout the history of the publishing of Jewish books, various works have been censored or banned. These can be divided into two main categories: Censorship by a non-Jewish government, and self-censorship. Self-censorship could be done either by the author himself, or by the publisher, out of fear from the gentiles or public reaction. Another important distinction that has to be made is between the censorship which existed already on manuscripts, before the printing press was invented, and the more official censorship after the printing press was invented. Gentile government censorship[edit] Many studies have been written on censorship and its influence on the publishing of Jewish books. For example, studies have appeared on the censorship of Jewish books when they were first starting to be published, in Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth century. Other studies have been written on the censorship of the Czarist government in Russia in the nineteenth century. Many of the "official" Christian government censors of Jewish books were Jewish apostates. The main reason for this was due to their knowledge of Hebrew, especially Rabbinic Hebrew. In Czarist Russia in the nineteenth century, it was decreed that Jewish books could only be published in two cities, Vilnius and Zhitomir. Censorship by Jewish religious authorities[edit] See also: The Talmud explains this to mean the book of Ben Sirah Sirach. In the early thirteenth century the philosophical book The Guide for the Perplexed by Maimonides was prohibited to be read until one was older by some French and Spanish Jewish leaders, because of the perceived danger of philosophy. Philosophy was prohibited to be learned until the age of forty. The same restriction was later applied to Kabbalah , in the fifteenth century. In the s, the kabbalistic works of Rabbi Moshe Chaim Luzzato were banned by religious leaders. In the s, the book Pri Chadash was banned in Egypt for arguing on earlier authorities. Marc Shapiro points out that not all books considered heretical by Orthodox Jews are banned; only those books on which there is a risk that Orthodox Jews may read them are banned. The Reconstructionist Siddur , revised by Mordecai Kaplan. It was banned because it discussed the value of studying subjects other than Torah. It was banned because it was perceived to have said unflattering things about the Netziv. It was banned because it explained how the theory of evolution can fit with Judaism; evolution is opposed by many authorities. It was banned because it was perceived to equate Judaism with other religions. One People, Two Worlds: Kosher Jesus , by Rabbi Shmuley Boteach , was banned in by the Chabad rabbi Jacob Immanuel Schochet , who labelled the book as heretical and stated that it "poses a tremendous risk to the Jewish community," and that "I have never read a book, let alone one authored by a purported frum Jew, that does more to enhance the evangelical missionary message and agenda than the aforementioned book". The publication review requirement does not apply to most online content or local promotional material. According to the Universal House of Justice , the highest governing body of the religion, The purpose of review is to protect the Faith against misrepresentation by its own followers at this early stage of its existence when comparatively few people have any knowledge of it.

Chapter 5 : A History of Censorship in Islamic Societies (Trevor Mostyn)

Censorship in Islamic societies's wiki: Islamic teachings and argument have been used to censor opinions and writings throughout history, up to and including the modern era, and thus there are many cases of censorship in Islamic societies.

Chapter 6 : Religious Censorship | Censorship in America

"Censorship in Islamic Societies" by Trevor Mostry, who taught at Algiers University before joining the Middle East Economic Digest c. s. The author complains about the various `censorship' regulations in economic, political, editorial and social subjects throughout the Middle East.

Chapter 7 : Censorship in Islamic societies News and Updates from The Economic Times

The entire wikipedia with video and photo galleries for each article. Find something interesting to watch in seconds.

Chapter 8 : Censorship in Islamic Societies | Saqi Books

Censorship in Islamic Societies has 1 rating and 0 reviews. A study of the question of freedom of expression in the Middle East. Includes analysis of cen.

Chapter 9 : Censorship in Islamic Societies by Trevor Mostyn

A study of censorship in Islamic societies, concentrating on key events throughout history. The text includes analysis of: censorship in Algeria the "fatwa" against Salman Rushdie Taliban repression in Afghanistan and the transmission on British TV of "Death of a Princess".