

**Vanderlei de Castro
Ezequiel**
Faculdade Cásper Líbero

Hate speech in contemporary politics: Trump won!

Deysi Cioccarì
Pontifícia Universidade
Católica de São Paulo –
PUC-SP

ABSTRACT

This study presents a reflection on the presence of hate speech in contemporary politics. In addition to the conceptual approach to the subject, the study presents a concrete case of hate speech: a statement by Donald J. Trump at the beginning of the North American electoral campaign and its impact. This reflection is subsidized by the Discourse Analysis of French current, understanding the political discourse (Charaudeau) as enunciation of a time. The thesis of the Society of the Spectacle (Debord) leads the critical analysis of the corpus. It is concluded that the hate speech in the contemporary political scene expresses profound relationship with the spectacularization of politics.

Keywords: Election campaign. Hate speech. Freedom of speech. Spectacularization.

RESUMEN

Este trabajo trae una reflexión sobre la presencia del discurso de odio en la política contemporánea. Además del enfoque conceptual del tema, el trabajo presenta un caso concreto de discurso de odio: un pronunciamiento de Donald J. Trump al inicio de la campaña electoral norteamericana y su repercusión. La presente reflexión es subsidiada por el Análisis de Discurso de línea francesa, entendiendo el discurso político (Charaudeau) como enunciación de una época. Las tesis de la Sociedad del Espectáculo (Debord) conducen el análisis crítico del corpus. Se concluye que el discurso de odio en la escena política contemporánea expresa íntima relación con la espectacularización de la política. Palabras claves: Campaña electoral. Discurso de odio. La libertad de expresión. Espectacularización.

RESUMO

Este trabalho traz uma reflexão sobre a presença do discurso de ódio na política contemporânea. Além da abordagem conceitual do tema, o trabalho apresenta um caso concreto de discurso de ódio: um pronunciamiento de Donald J. Trump no início da campanha eleitoral norteamericana e sua repercussão. A presente reflexão é subsidiada pela Análise de Discurso de linha francesa, entendendo o discurso político (Charaudeau) como enunciação de uma época. As teses da Sociedade do Espectáculo (Debord) conduzem a análise crítica do corpus. Conclui-se que o discurso de ódio na cena política contemporânea expressa íntima relação com a espetacularização da política. Palavras-chaves: Campanha eleitoral. Discurso de ódio. Liberdade de expressão. Espectacularização.

Submissão: 22-10-2014

Decisão editorial: 15-08-2017

Introduction

Contemporary society is experiencing a time of exacerbation of negative speeches, generating an ambience of animosity that tensions the collectives. In addition to increasing the global crisis of human rights, the denial of ethical values ends justifying political aggressions and increasing the vulnerability of minorities.

Daily, the news agencies disclose violations of fundamental rights, wars, insecurity and erosion of the minimum conditions for the life of the people. In this sense, the North American presidential election of 2016 emerges as a synthesis of the negative speeches or hate speeches. Considered as one of the political phenomena most covered by the media, considering that communication is the main support that shapes and makes visible the politics, the election campaign for President of the United States has the capacity to amplify – on a global scale – the speeches of the candidates. It is in this context that we find the political speech of Donald J. Trump that, being directed to minority ethnic groups, is characterized by the imposition of a certain stigma of dangerousness on this population, in addition to promoting their legal and political-territorial exclusion in the United States.

In any democracy, there is an electoral contest and a struggle for power, where the vote is exercised by interests, ideas, affections or charisms. In the classic view of political campaigns, the candidates always strive to convey promises of a better future. According to the Mexican researcher in social sciences Alberto Aziz Nassif, into the North American presidential campaign of 2016 this order was changed, "[...] and in its place there is a loss of democracy, an expression of unease that polarizes and divides radically" (Nassif, 2016, p.16).

It is understood that democracy is the system that presupposes the dissent, that is to say that the democratic order implies the balance in the conflict. However, for democracy to exist there must be respect for the uniqueness and for the fundamental rights that the institutions and the citizens owe to the other with whom they coexist. In this way, the essence of democracy is, therefore, the acceptance of plurality, which implies the peaceful coexistence of differences.

As another pillar of democracy, freedom of speech is an indispensable right that ensures the transit of views by the public space. It is an inalienable right of every individual to express his thoughts without any embarrassment or censure. It is, therefore, an essential component of democratic societies, which have their pillars on equality and freedom.

However, the freedom of speech is not absolute, and cannot be relied upon for the practice of intolerance and prejudice in any order. Also should not be the basis for the defense of the use of expressions that characterize criminal stances as defamation, libel, slander or incitement to any form of violence.

The objective of this study is to reflect on the presence of hate speech in contemporary politics. The study starts with a theoretical foundation on the hate speech and follows with a brief discussion on freedom of speech. Then presents a statement from Donald J. Trump at the beginning of the North American electoral campaign and its repercussions. It ends with a critical analysis about the spectacularization of politics. This reflection is subsidized by the Discourse Analysis of French current, and the discussion around the ideas of Trump is anchored in the analysis carried out by several authors, mainly from Latin America.

Hate Speech

In general, hate speech is the type of speech that promotes hate and incites discrimination, hostility and violence. It refers to any act of communication that disparage or demean a person, using verifiable aspects of discrimination such as: gender, race, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, among others. Furthermore, the hate speech is also used to persecute, insult and justify the deprivation of human rights. In extreme cases, it can give reason to murder and genocides like the Holocaust in Nazi Germany. According to Silva *et al.*,

The hate speech is composed of two basic elements: discrimination and externality. It is a segregationist manifestation based on the dichotomy of superior (sender) and inferior (affected) and, as a manifestation that it is, it only exists when it is known to someone other than its author. In order to form a satisfactory concept, must be examined these two aspects, starting with the externality. (2011, p.447)

Like any discursive expression, the discourse of hatred requires the concretization of the ideas, that is, leave the mental plane to the factual plan. Unexpressed, the speech is just a thought, an emotion, not causing any harm to those who are its target. The problem arises when the thought is expressed, giving way to the presence of the word. Thus, the speech gains concrete existence and becomes available to those who seek to denigrate and also to those who intend to incite action against the demeaned. Implemented, the speech accomplishes its harmful effects, highlighting: attack on the dignity of others and violations of fundamental rights. In short, when publicly expressed, hate speech causes damage.

Under the law, the hate speech is any speech, conduct or gesture, spoken, written or represented that could incite violence or express a discriminatory action against others, offending or intimidating people. There is an international consensus on the need to ban hate speech, considering also that this ban cannot hurt the principle of freedom of speech, essential for the maintenance of democracy.

The hate speech can also be divided into two acts: the insult and incitement. The first refers directly to the victim, i.e., the damage to a person or group of people who share a certain trait. The second act is directed to third parties, not identified with the victims, who are summoned to strengthen the group of aggressors, not only in the discourse, but also with actions.

In its strategy of persuasion, the hate speech uses instruments and techniques in the area of publicity and advertising for obtain adepts, including: the creation of stereotypes, the substitution of names, the

exclusive selection of facts favorable to their point of view, the creation of “enemies”, the appeal to authority and the affirmation and repeat (Brown *apud* Silva et al., 2011, p.448). Another strategy used to increase the probability of acceptance of this discourse is the use of emotional arguments.

When a person directs a hate speech to another, dignity gets vulnerable in its intersubjectivity dimension, in the respect that every human being owes to another. But not only that. In the case of hate speech, it goes beyond: it is an attack on the dignity of an entire social group, not just of an individual. Even if this individual has been directly affected, those who share the characteristic that caused the discrimination, when they come into contact with the hate speech, share the situation of violation. It produces the so-called *diffuse victimization*. (Silva et al., 2011, p.449)

The negative consequences of incitement to hatred are varied and can be unpredictable. In attacking the honor and dignity of a person, hate speech can affect an entire group in a similar way. As stated by the Chilean researcher Álvaro Paúl Díaz,

In summary, it is clear that incitement to hatred may affect the rights of the group object of this discourse in a more or less serious way. In extreme cases, the freedom of speech of some can even contribute to physical damage to certain minorities. However, the protection of honor, dignity and physical integrity of those affected by hate speech, promotion of equity and multiculturalism, etc., are all reasons that serve to discuss the negative effects of incitement to hatred – where there is broad agreement between the restrictive and liberal approaches –, not to discuss the appropriateness or effectiveness of its penalization. (2011, p. 589-90)

Individuals or groups affected by the hate speech are invariably subjects under conditions of vulnerability, recognized as belonging to the non-dominant group.

An important debate

The New Zealander researcher Jeremy Waldron defines 'hate speech' as "publications that express deep contempt, hatred and libel against members of minority groups" (Waldron, 2012, p.27). For the researcher, hatred is an emotion of contempt, intolerance with extreme disgust. In this sense, the hate speech is one that expresses, encourages, causes or supports the hatred against a particular group of individuals or collectivity, distinguished especially by gender, race, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, among others. The author defends legal restrictions on hate speech, supporting a kind of prohibitive regulation of public statements that might disturb social peace or directly attack members of vulnerable minorities. Many countries, such as Germany, New Zealand, Canada, Denmark and the United Kingdom, according to the author, have adopted some type of regulation or laws prohibiting public statements such as those that:

[...] encourage "hatred against any identifiable group where such incitement is likely to lead to a violation of social peace" (Canada); or "declarations by which a group of people is threatened, ridiculed or degraded by its race, skin color, nationality or ethnicity" (Denmark); or attacks on the "dignity of others by insulting, malicious defamation or defaming segments of the population" (Germany); or "threatening, abusive or insulting words [...] that might excite hostility against or reduce to ignominy any group of people [...] based

on color, race or ethnicity, or ethnic or national origins of a group of people" (New Zealand); or the use of "threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviors, when they are intended to incite racial hatred," or when "considering all circumstances, racial hatred is capable of causing unrest in this manner" (United Kingdom). (Waldron, 2012, p.8)

The defining characteristic of hate speech, according to Waldron, is its ability to violate human dignity, not understood in absolute terms, but as a special social status that must be reinforced by law. Thus, dignity is translated as the recognition that every person can – and should – demand from his fellow citizens about his condition of individual able to life in society. The concept of dignity, in this sense, concerns the way in which a person is received in society, a situation that goes beyond the formal requirements of citizenship – political rights, passport, among others. The dignity is associated with a person's reputation in society. (Waldron, 2012, p.138-43)

Waldron asserts that the defamatory speech adopted against a group or a collectivity, by undermining the dignity of its members, should be prohibited by law. The defamation undermines the social status of the individual, diminishing his human condition before the majority of the society in which he lives and, consequently, his acceptance. So, for the author, it is the policy to ensure, through law, the protection of the "dignity of people and their decent treatment in society" (Waldron, 2012, p.107). Still according to Waldron,

Individually or in a group, these attacks against reputation are equivalent to an assault against the dignity of the people. Dignity understood as a basic social condition of

individuals, recognition of their social equality and of their status of holders of human and constitutional rights. (Waldron, 2010, p.1610)

With regard to the effects of hate speech, Waldron adopts as a parameter of evaluation the concept formulated by John Rawls of "well ordered society", that is, one in which all its members accept the same principles of justice. This is an ideal to be pursued by every authentically democratic society. Conceptually, a well-ordered society should adopt a general commitment to the principles of justice and dignity owed to all members of society. Thus, "a society may not be well-ordered if people advocate racial or religious hatred, considering that a well-ordered society is widely and effectively ruled by a conception of justice". (Waldron, 2012, p. 77-8).

Consequently, everything that affects the way society presents itself to its citizens, and that put at risk the society's commitment to their dignity, should be censored. In this sense, it is observed that hate speech is not just a set of ideas that flows to the public debate, but it is an activity that defines the social environment, making more difficult the integration of minorities in society. Thus, it is understood that the way that a society presents itself publicly is the main way of transmit security to its members. The hate speech directly attacks this trust and, in particular, goes against the idea of justice and dignity in society, ignoring that dignity is inherent to the human condition.

For the author, the hate speech damages the dignity of individuals belonging to defamed groups, disfiguring the appearance of society as a collectivity compromised with the most basic principles of justice, distancing itself from the ideal of a well-ordered so-

ciety. The hate speech disfigures the societies, making them hostile to members of minorities and attacked groups.

Those who emit, publish or post expressions of hatred against a minority are contributing to the increase of violence in society. Even though a hate speech alone may not seem so significant, it is a general and diffuse attack and, in some cases, even implicit. In this sense, Waldron has the great merit of removing the attention of those who are uttering the speech to those who are the victims of the speech.

The main argument against the criminalization of hate speech is the defense of freedom of expression. It is understood that the restriction to any freedom is a matter of discussion (and should be), and in this sense the discussion about freedom of speech refers to the very notion of democracy. Thus, the stance against the enactment of laws that criminalize hate speech uses the argument that this may compromise the democratic process itself. The philosopher of American law Ronald Dworkin is one of the leading proponents of this argument.

Dworkin understands that freedom of speech is a universal and unrestricted right (or almost unrestricted), being an integral part of democracy. So, the basic principle that supports the freedom of speech as a universal human right is the requirement that everyone should be treated with equal concern and respect, i.e., acceptance of the condition of human dignity. (Dworkin, 2009, p.vi-vii)

Although majoritarian processes are a necessary condition for political legitimacy, a just democracy, according to Dworkin, must have what he calls *democratic background*. Thus, the decision of the majority

will only be fair when everyone has the opportunity to express their opinions, fears or tastes or even prejudices. The author understands that by establishing restrictions on freedom of speech, as fences to hate speech, the State would cease to respect the status of each individual as a free and equal member of the political community (Dworkin, 2009, p.vii). So, democracy must seek legitimacy through majority processes, but also guarantee the right of every citizen to participate in the process by which collective decisions are made, freely expressing their opinions.

The central argument of Dworkin relates the right to freedom of speech with the legitimacy of law. The author claims that a law is only legitimate if a broad debate is allowed on the subject, allowing even the hate speech. Restrictions on freedom of speech in cases of hate speech is a central concern for the author, since such restrictions can be used by legislative majorities or by the government itself in order to silence voices that are contrary to their ideals or interests. (Dworkin, 2009, p.ix)

For the author, in a democracy, "[...] nobody, however powerful or impotent, may have the right not to be insulted or offended" (Dworkin, 2009, p.8). This is an important argument for those who defend freedom of expression. In a democratic society, which guarantees freedom of expression as a fundamental right, individuals should discuss issues of public relevance without any kind of exclusion. Nobody can be excluded from participating in a public debate because others may feel offended by their ideas. It is not possible to receive only favorable ideas, but also those that hatch, offend and disturb. According to the defenders of freedom of speech, in modern and

pluralist democracies it would be practically impossible to achieve public debates without somehow shock, offend or disturb anyone.

It is understood that a democratic state should tolerate the risks inherent in the political dispute, especially in the electoral period, allowing an ample debate with the incorporation of all opinions, otherwise it will affect the very democratic quality if are excluded certain ideological positions deemed “aggressive”. To the titular professor of criminal law at the Rey Juan Carlos University, *Rafael Alcácer Guirao*,

The right of citizens to form their own convictions and to freely decide their representatives should lead to that all points of view are subject to the scrutiny of social dialog, even with the risk that some of these opinions may affect the public peace, that some people might feel offended or that the dialectical modes and strategies of electoral discourse – manipulations, provocations and promises that will not be fulfilled – can deceive other people and generate false images about social reality, integrity of other politicians or customs or aspirations of a social group. (2012, p. 28-29)

Although considered powerful tools for the development of a democratic society, the views are not harmless. On the other hand, free political discourse is liable to generate social risks and upheavals. However, the communicative freedom cannot be restricted to the issue of socially harmless messages, because it is only through dissidence and dialectical confrontation that the formation of public opinion is possible.

Guirao believes that a stable democratic society should be able to tolerate the social imbalance. Since the freedom of political expression is at stake, society must have methods of rebalancing other than the

criminalization of intolerant discourse: "In the face of hate speech, is the free exchange of ideas, the rational dialogue and the critical awareness of citizens that will come to socially neutralize xenophobic and discriminatory messages" (Guirao, 2012, p. 29).

However, the freedom of speech cannot override the right of others, nor can it tarnish the image or dignity of others. In this way, it is understood that societies have different levels of tolerance with discourses that abuse freedom of expression. As Díaz stated, "these will depend on several factors, such as the naturalization of the legal interest affected, the subjective conditions of the public, the greater or lesser publicity of the expression, the social conditions of the state where it is offered, etc." (Díaz, 2011, p. 603).

According to the Colombian researcher on criminal law José Manuel Díaz Soto, the positioning of Dworkin is backed by the current North American jurisprudence,

The Supreme Court of the United States points out and reiterates with its measures the liberal approach to hate speech, which translates into a greater tolerance on the part of governmental authorities regarding hate speech; is undoubtedly opted for respect for freedom of expression. (Soto, 2015, p.99)

The European Court of Human Rights – ECHR –, on the other hand, qualifies hate speech as an abuse of power, because it is understood that it affects the dignity and the respect guarded by the European Convention of Human Rights. According to Soto, Waldron's theses are supported by the jurisprudence of the ECHR,

[...] that identifies real stories of hate speech as a form of abuse of the law proscribed by article 17 of the Convention, whose prohibition is not subject to discriminatory message which also involves the incitement to violence; anachronistic requirement that is currently required by US jurisprudence. (Soto, 2015, p.99)

Trump and the hate speech

Currently, one of the most worrying cases of hate speech – that reaches global scale – is the tycoon-politic Donald J. Trump. His way of expressing varies from negative, irreverent, and aggressive. During the election campaign, the declarations of Trump were particularly harmful to minorities, discriminatory and, sometimes, were apologies of crimes. According to the Mexican researcher on constitutional law Isaac de Paz Gonzalez, “this speech shows a new face of global fascism that seeks the confrontation, political violence and the justification of the state for to depart from legal values and public ethics in its universal sense” (Gonzalez, 2016, p.28).

In June 2015, during a press conference in which he confirmed his candidacy for President of the United States of America, the billionaire Donald J. Trump made the following comment:

When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. [...] They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people. (CNN Español, 2015)

The political discourse always leads to confrontation between its actors, but the political dispute during electoral campaigns in a democratic society cannot

admit the spread of a genocidal ideology. In the United States there are no rules for protection against political aggression in the clash during campaigns. According to Gonzalez, "maybe because the discursive strategies are considered part of the electoral tensions to gain advantage and strengthen the discourse of power in the struggle for the presidency" (2016, p.35).

A report published in 2016, referring to a research conducted by Teaching Tolerance, a project of the nonprofit organization Southern Poverty Law, detected consequences of hate speech of Trump. The attacks are more perceived by young people belonging to marginalized groups and, in some cases, already stigmatized in society. The report mentions:

More than two-thirds (67 percent) of teachers reported that young people in their schools – mainly immigrants, children of immigrants, Muslims, African Americans and other students of color – have expressed concerns about what might happen to them or their families after the election. Approximately one-third of the students in classrooms are children of parents born abroad. This year, they are frightened, distressed and need assurance and support from teachers. Muslim children are harassed and worried. Even native African-American children, whose families arrived here before the American Revolution, ask about being sent back to Africa. Others, especially the younger students, have worries that are the stuff of nightmares, like a return to slavery or being rounded up and put into camps. (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016, p.6)

The consequences of a political discourse of a violent nature, depending on repercussion, can generate alarming risks for democracy: "Certainly, political language brings with it an open confrontation that causes the erosion of the universal value system that

forms the common basis of human rights" (Gonzalez, 2016, p. 33). So, the appearance of an authoritarian candidate subverts the values of the community, disrupts everyday life, revealing signs of discrimination and social division.

Also according to the report of the American organization, a high school teacher of Westmoreland wrote:

"Many students think we should kill all people with whom we do not agree. They also think that all Muslims are equal and are a threat to our country and way of life. They believe that all Muslims want to kill us." Muslim students – along with Sikh and Hindu students who are confused with Muslims – have suffered high levels of abuse. According to reports from all over the country, Muslim students are regularly called ISIS, terrorists, or suicide bombers. These views are often expressed with spite. Even in schools where such behavior is not tolerated, discussions of current events often become uncomfortable for Muslim teachers and students [...] Students do not understand why it became a campaign such an angry and hateful campaign. They are taught to behave well by their teachers, and then they see this mess on TV and are confused. (Sothern Poverty Law Center, 2016, p. 10)

In this way, the speeches and pronouncements of Trump may have generated social pathologies in U.S. schools, where children and young people belonging to groups insulted by Trump face anxiety, feelings of rejection and exclusion. The cited examples indicate that incitement to hatred not only affects individuals and groups to whom it is addressed, it also amends the social climate, promoting the fear, the polarization and the humiliation of the groups attacked.

Among the many policies that Trump promised to deploy are: expulsion of immigrants; construction of a wall on the border with Mexico; create a register of all Muslims living in the country and prohibit the entry of new Muslims; allow the use of techniques of torture against prisoners accused of terrorism. The public statements of the candidate “reflect the extremist rhetoric as part of the degradation of politics and its tendency to generate new conditions of aggression to ethnographic groups, different from those of their political preference” (Gonzalez, 2016, p. 29), in addition to creating a fertile field for the emergence of new structural forms of erosion of the culture of human rights, multiculturalism and public peace.

Speech, politics and hatred

It is understood that the discourse is the place for the reproduction of speeches of classes and fractions of classes. Thus, world views are materialized in the language in its different manifestations: verbal, visual, gestural, etc. The way in which the world is understood, at any given moment, is subordinated to the themes and figures established by these worldviews. For Charaudeau, politics is a real battlefield in which a symbolic war is waged, aiming to establish relations of domination or covenants of convention. The political discourse aims, therefore, to influence opinions in order to obtain accessions to the proposals it advocates, or to reject the opposing projects.

The political discourse does not exhaust, in any way, the whole political concept, but there is no politics without discourse. This is constitutive of that. Language is what motivates action, it is what guides it and gives it meaning. Politics depends on action and is constitu-

tively inscribed in relations of social influence, and the language, due to the phenomenon of circulation of discourses, is what allows spaces for discussion, persuasion and seduction in which are elaborated thinking and action. Political action and political discourse are inextricably linked, which justifies, by the same reasoning, political study through discourse. (Charadeau, 2011, p.39)

The Discourse Analysis (hereafter DA) proposes several methodologies to uncover regularities and mechanisms by which speech (written or oral) is produced and interpreted in situations of communication. The methods of DA have provided the unveiling of a series of hegemonic relations not apparent in the communicative manifestations, but which are apprehendable in the discursive dimension.

It is assumed, as stated by Eni Puccinelli Orlandi, that the purpose of the DA is:

[...] the understanding of how a symbolic object produces meanings, how it is invested with significance for and by subjects. This understanding, in turn, implies in explaining how the text organizes the gestures of interpretation that relate subject and meaning. New reading practices are thus produced. (2010, p. 26-27)

As an important concept in the Discourse Analysis, the conditions of production (hereafter CP) bring to the discourse the social places and their representations, and bring the relations of strength and the world relations of society, regardless of the contextual dimension – strict or.¹The immediate context of enuncia-

1 As stated by Brandão, the CP «constitute the verbal instance of discourse production, the historical-social context, the interlocutors, the place where they speak and the image they have of themselves, of the other and of the one that refers»

tion of the analyzed discourse – CP in the strict sense – refers to the speech of Donald J. Trump in June 2015, during a press conference in which he confirmed his candidacy for the presidency of the United States of America. Known for his controversial statements, the Republican candidate begins his campaign by sustain an extremist rhetoric of front rejection of immigrants – mostly Mexicans and Muslims – generating conditions of aggression to the ethnographic groups that are targets of his political discourse. Moreover, the statements of the Republican candidate created a fertile ground for the emergence of new structural forms of a culture of erosion of rights and public peace, exacerbating xenophobic trends among its constituents.

On the other hand, the CP in the broad sense also include, in addition to the socio-historical context, the imaginary produced by institutions, about what was said, and about memory. In this way, it is noted that the Mexican community – as well as the Muslim community – incorporates the symbol of the “different” in the ideology of Trump and, therefore, causes fear. On the other hand, the supporters of the Republican candidate does not have the perception that

(2004, p.105). According to Orlandi, the strict sense of CP refers to the immediate context of enunciation, while the broad sense includes the socio-historical and ideological contexts. In the broad sense, the CP include, in addition to the socio-historical context, the imaginary produced by institutions about the already-said, the memory. For Orlandi, this «memory of saying» refers to interdiscourse, i.e., to the exterior that constitutes the discourse: «The interdiscourse is the entire set of formulations made and already forgotten that determine what we say. For that my words to make sense, they should already make sense. And this is an interdiscourse effect: what was said by a specific subject, at a particular moment, needs to be erased in memory and (anonymized), it needs to make sense in (my) words» (2010, p.33-4).

they are facing an ideological discourse, but an idea that approximates the common sense. According to the Mexican researcher in the social sciences José Franco Aguilar,

Trump and his speech echoed his followers bringing the idea that Americans have the immigrant as an enemy and must act before him. Trump appears as the guard that confronts, without measuring his words to what he considers different. Under an essentialist and irrational view, xenophobia, unfounded criticism and, without doubt, the violence were once again discussed. (2016, p. 23)

The collective memory is also driven by the speech of the candidate when it refer to the perspective of ethnic superiority, remembering that the country has experienced a long period of slavery. In addition, Trump's speech recalls the typical manifestations of dictatorships of the last century, in which xenophobic tendencies justified genocides, apartheid, and gulags of the 20th century. In this regard, Díaz warns that:

[...] the incitement to hatred through the mass media can have very serious effects, as recognized by the Nuremberg Tribunal and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. These latter cases are extreme, since they incited genocide in the media. (Díaz, 2011, p. 589)

Recently, humanity witnessed extreme events such as the genocide against Armenians and jews, racist aggressions in Africa, annihilation of political opponents in Latin America (Brazil, Argentina, Chile). However, history teaches that the non-acceptance of the difference of race, religion, ideology, among others, is converted into an exacerbation of the division of

society and into persecution of “enemy” groups. The suppression of rights facilitates the aggressions of the state apparatus against the “undesirable”, and then it legalizes its annihilation. Therefore, a speech so belligerent and discriminatory cannot go unnoticed, because as Gonzalez says,

The prelude to physical aggression is the propaganda in political language that ultimately becomes the doctrine of authoritarian regimes. Thus, the harmful effects of the Republican candidate's hate campaign are palpable in the daily life of the people of minority groups in the United States. (Gonzalez, 2016, p. 30)

According to Orlandi, sayings are not only decodable messages, but effects of significations produced under certain conditions, and that leave traces in the way they are said,

They are clues that he learns to follow in order to understand the meanings therefrom, putting the saying in relation to its exteriority, its conditions of production. These meanings are related to what is said there, but also in other places, as well as what is not said, and what could be said and was not. In this way, the margins of saying, of the text, are also a part of it. (2010, p.30)

On the other hand, the meanings are also produced from memory, from history. Thus, what is not said in the discourse sequence here analyzed refers to an alleged distinction between citizens and foreigners. Apparently, Trump's view on the concept of citizenship uses exclusionary criteria, making citizenship an exclusive category of a group politically recogni-

zed by the state. This would be a form of protection of sovereignty, a fact disputed by Gonzalez,

This condition is a contradiction in terms, since it turns out that the (state) laws of the market allow the exchange of goods and services, trade flows, cultural mechanisms and ideologies, but does not allow the flow of people under minimum rules, but impose conditions of difficult implementation. (Gonzalez, 2016, p. 26-27)

On the margins of the text, it is possible to identify that, in addition to the promises to close the United States to immigrants and build a wall on the border with Mexico, Trump presented himself with a high trade protectionism, promoting conservative values.

The constitution of the meanings and the subjects of discourse occurs in processes, where coexist the symbolic games – over which we do not have control – and the misconception, through the work of ideology and of the unconscious. In this way, one can affirm that world views are materialized in language in its different manifestations: verbal, visual, gestural. Thus, the spontaneous and aggressive manifestation of Trump against immigrants reveals a probable racist heritage that interfered in its formation.

The spectacularization of hatred

Donald Trump's hate speech during the electoral campaign has widely resonated in mainstream media, generating heated debates on social media. Even discounting the most aggressive positions of the followers of the candidate, there was an avalanche of mistaken comments, revealing ignorance about the context surrounding the subject. The advent of information technologies strengthens the news and also

its unfolding. Thus, it is understood that the speech of Trump had great potential to stimulate public debate, and the messages of followers who reiterated the hate speech reverberated on social media.

In contemporary society, knowledge is constituted preferably from the receipt of symbolic forms published by the media. The prevalence of communication technologies and the ease of access to information affect life in the public space, giving more importance to the media. According to Vera Chaia,

The media should be analyzed in this range of possibilities: informing and shaping public opinion. The representations constructed by the media have become fundamental in individual and social experiences in the contemporary world. (2004, p.23)

What is conveyed in the discourse of the media has the capacity to influence collectives, or part of them. The rumor² spread by the media tends to increase the sense of insecurity, favoring the emergence of aggressive behaviors that escape critical control. In addition, as Gonzalez reminds us,

These discourses influence the culture of communication, the substance of the political message and the struggle for power; in this way, they must not only be disqualified by society, but analyzed with the normative and axiological tools of human rights, which have emerged precisely as a guideline of peoples and of the international community to limit the abuse of power. (2016, p. 22)

2 In accordance with Delumeau, «a rumor is born, therefore, on a prior set of accumulated worries and it results from a mental preparation created by the convergence of various threats or various misfortunes that add up to their effects» (2009, p.269).

In order to achieve its goals and cause harm, the hate speech needs to be conveyed by a communication medium which, depending on the diffuser power of the media, may be less or more harmful. Although the development of the means of communication and the information technologies provides an intense exchange between people, democratizing information, on the other hand, it also increases the reach of pernicious contents, such as hate speech. Ezekiel points out that “the media, as a producer of information, poses itself as a source of systems of representation of reality, and is used to understand society” (2015, p.118).

According to Debord, in terms of techniques, the “constructed” image can become the main connection of the individual with the real world, which he experienced for himself. In the spectacular society, there is no more space to live our own experiences, the models live in our place: “everything that was directly lived becomes a representation” (2004, p.13).³

The media, in the so-called information society, represent a privileged field in contention for hegemony. According to Cláudio Coelho, “the triumph of the society of the spectacle can be summed up by the monopolization of appearance by the ruling class and its employees (those who think/act at their service)”, (2006, p.18).

3 The foundations of the critique of Debord are the daily life and the generalization of the fetishism of commodity, which invaded all areas of life in society. The commodification of everything produces the uninterrupted spectacle. In it, time, space, recreation, communication, culture and everything else is permeated by alienation. For Debord, «the spectacle is not a set of images, but a social relationship between people, mediated by images» (2004, p.14).

During the election campaign, Trump's speech drew much of the American news, and in some instances also the international media, imposing themes such as racial hatred and xenophobia – Mexicans and Muslims –, discrimination against blacks and misogyny, used to disqualify his opponent, Hillary Clinton. Basically, one can understand the Trump phenomenon by his ability to “shape the mind”, i.e., his power over the behavior of voters, based on emotions like anger and anxiety. Even among those who harshly criticized the positions taken by Trump during the campaign, it was not questioned from where these positions came from, or what the root of this speech was.

The discourse of Trump was built based on fear and anger against the dangers that threaten the United States. The map that Trump called for his followers is based on what David Berg, a psychiatrist at Yale University, describes as security threats. There are two types of threats: internal, such as demographic change, the greed of Wall Street, immigration, the consequences of income inequality; and external, such as international disorder, ISIS, China, Russia. (Nassif, 2016, p. 19)

In accordance with Delumeau, a population seeks an explanation for its misfortune whenever it is threatened; “find causes of an evil is to recreate a reassuring framework, is to reconstitute a coherence from which will logically come the indication of remedies” (2009: 201). To accuse others is the first movement and the most natural in these situations; “appoint guilty was to bring the inexplicable back to a comprehensible process “ (2009: 204). The *other* awakens distrust, because it belongs to a different universe. When the individual is threatened – or when he believe to be threatened –, therefore, when he feels

afraid, he tends to see enemies on all sides, especially among those who are different, who think differently. Then the fear of the *other* is manifested. According to Delumeau, “The root of this lies in the tension that arises between people who do not know each other, or who are little known, people who come from outside, who do not look like us and, above all, who do not live the same way we live” (2007, p. 45-46).

The speeches of the candidate Trump, spectacularized by the media, favored the personalization of politics. However, in the discourse examined here, the main theme is not the figure of the candidate, but the prejudice and intolerance of his speech. As stated Cioccarri,

The spectacularization in politics constrained by the personalization of candidates is not a recent phenomenon. This practice is recurring in leaders, kings, emperors of the most remote situations throughout history, but since the last century it is impossible to ignore the changes resulting from the ubiquity of the mass communication. On the other side, we see a receiver distant from decisions of power, mostly with low degree of political sophistication and who finds in the media space the easiest way to get informed. (2015, p.41)

Those responsible for the campaign of Donald Trump have imposed a campaign model that worked like a clock. Although it was not original, there was a mediatic logic behind the aggressiveness and the arrogance. In this way, the character Trump expressed himself successfully to important sectors of the United States, becoming highly competitive. For Nassif, “Trump is the nostalgia of a country that no longer exists, neither in its geographical composition

nor in its racial plurality nor in its global economic dynamics" (2016, p. 17).

The discourse of Trump presented here should be understood as an example of a political culture permeated by traits of authoritarianism and patronage, serving as a stimulus for the discussion about the spectacularization of hate speech in electoral campaigns.

Conclusion

It is understood that the constitutional guarantees that support freedom of speech are intended to protect discourses considered disturbing or irritating to some sectors of the population. The problem is in determining which expressions should be tolerated in order to maintain the foundations of a democratic society. Those who advocate the prohibition of hate speech argue that the penalty of incitement to hatred is an effective instrument to combat it. However, some researchers consider that criminalizing hate speech can generate unwanted contrary effects, since, instead of silencing the offender, it can give him greater publicity and a certain aura of martyrdom, of persecuted. In a way, this strategy seems to have been appropriated by the organizers of the Trump campaign.

In the current international political scenario, in which the recognition of fundamental rights is at the heart of the claims, the spectacularized speeches of hatred in the media generate social representations in which it is possible to identify forms of discrimination and prejudice. In addition, the political debate in electoral campaigns overflows in social media, stage of ideological disputes empty of argumentation and of poor consistency, where there are too many attacks, insults and hatred.

In this study, the hate speech of the political figure Donald J. Trump was presented as a confrontation against the rights of Mexican immigrants. Voices were presented in defense of the broad freedom of expression, on behalf of the right to freedom of speech and of democratic legitimacy. Arguments against manifestations of intolerance were also presented, defending restrictions on speeches and manifestations of hatred as a necessary and legitimate measure when the aim is to protect the dignity of individuals and, consequently, the very democratic culture.

It is concluded that the hate speech, spectacularized in mainstream media and on social media, fosters the hostility and the prejudice and corrupts democratic and tolerant atmosphere. Certainly, the democratic culture is vulnerable to the acceptance and the growth of hatred. It is precisely thinking of avoiding this “pollution” and degradation of the social environment, with the rise of hatred to public space, that it is understood that it is necessary to accept laws that prohibit speeches of hatred.

References

Aguilar, J. F. 2016: *El discurso antiinmigrante de Donald Trump: ¿Ficción o realidad?* *Lasaforum*. Summer 2016, vol. 47, Issue 3, July 2016. pp. 20-3. Retrieved March 3, 2017, from: <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/forum/files/vol47-issue3/DonaldTrump-3.pdf>

Brandão, H. H. N. 2004: *Introdução à análise do discurso*. São Paulo: Unicamp.

Chaia, V. 2004: *Eleições no Brasil: o medo como estratégia política*. In: Rubim, A. A. C. (Org). *Eleições presidenciais em 2002 no Brasil*. São Paulo: Hacker, 2004, pp. 29-52.

Charaudeau, P. 2011: *Discurso político*. Translation by Dilson Ferreira da Cruz e Fabiana Komesu. São Paulo: Contexto.

Cioccari, D. 2015: *A espetacularização política brasileira: uma análise dos políticos midiáticos eleitos para o Congresso Nacional 2015-2019*. *Communicare*, v. 15, n. 2, pp. 38-50, 2º semestre/2015.

CNN Español 2015: *Trump: Mexicanos traen crimen y drogas y son violadores* [online]. Retrieved May 31, 2017, from <http://cnnespanol.cnn.com/2015/06/16/trump-mexicanos-traen-crimen-y-drogas-y-son-violadores/>

Coelho, C. N. P. 2006: *Em torno do conceito da sociedade do espetáculo*. In: Coelho, C. N. P.; Castro, V. J. de (Orgs.). *Comunicação e sociedade do espetáculo*. São Paulo: Ed. Paulus.

Debord, G. 2004: *A sociedade do espetáculo*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto.

Delumeau, J. 2007: *Medos de ontem e de hoje*. In: NOVAES, A. (Org). *Ensaio sobre o medo*. São Paulo: Senac, 2007, pp. 39-52.

_____. 2009: *História do medo no ocidente*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

Díaz, Á. P. 2011: *La penalización de la incitación al odio a la luz de la jurisprudencia comparada*. *Revista Chilena de Derecho*. Vol. 38, n. 2, 2011, pp. 573-609. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from <http://www.scielo.cl/pdf/rchilder/v38n3/art07.pdf>

Dworkin, R. 2009: *Foreword*. In: *Extreme speech and democracy*. Org: Hare, I. Weinstein, J. Nova York: Oxford University Press.

Ezequiel, V. C. 2015: *Discurso do medo e o ódio político na disputa eleitoral brasileira de 2014*. *Aurora*, v. 8, n. 23, pp. 98-119, jun-set/2015.

Gonzalez, I. de P. 2016: *La dimensión universal de los derechos humanos frente al discurso de odio de Donald J. Trump*. *DIGNITAS*, año X, n. 30, enero-abril 2016, pp. 15-42. Retrieved March 11, 2017, from <http://www.codhem.org.mx/LocalUser/codhem.org/difus/dignitas/dignitas30.pdf>

Guirao, R. A. 2012: *Discurso del odio y discurso político – em defesa*

de la libertad de los intolerantes. Revista eletrônica de ciência pena y criminologia. n. 14-02, 2012, pp. 1-32. Retrieved March 27, 2017, from <http://criminnet.ugr.es/recpc/14/recpc14-02.pdf>

Nassif, A. A. 2016: *Trump: Seducción mediática y escándalo político*. Revista Lasaforum. Summer 2016, v. 47, Issue 3, July 2016, pp. 16-9. Retrieved March 3, 2017, from <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/forum/files/vol47-issue3/DonaldTrump-2.pdf>

Orlandi, E. P. 2010: *Análise de discurso: princípios e procedimentos*. Campinas: Pontes Editores.

Silva, R. L. et al. 2011: *Discurso do ódio em redes sociais: jurisprudência brasileira*. Rev. direito GV, São Paulo, v. 7, n. 2, pp. 445-67, jul./dez. 2011.

Sothern Poverty Law Center 2016: *The Trump Effect The impact of the presidential campaign on our nation's schools*. Alabama, https://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/splc_the_trump_effect, 17 de abril de 2016. Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016. Retrieved from: https://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/trump_effect_final_comments_2.pdf. Acessado em: 15/05/2017.

Soto, J. M. D. 2015: *Una aproximación al concepto de discurso del ódio*. Revista Derecho del Estado n. 34, enero-junio de 2015, pp. 77-101. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from <http://revistas.uexternado.edu.co/index.php/derest/article/view/4202>

Waldron, J. 2010: *Dignity and defamation: the visibility of hate*. In: Harvard Law Review, v. 123, pp. 1596-657, 2010. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/vol123_waldron.pdf

Waldron, J. 2012: *The harm in hate speech*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.