ZBORNIK RADOVA

GOVOR MRŽNJE

NOVI SAD, 2022

ZBORNIK RADOVA

GOVOR MRŽNJE

Ana Vuković[∗]

HATE SPEECH VS. POLITICALLY CORRECT SPEECH: CAUSAL-CONSEQUENTIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Abstract: The paper considers hate speech and politically correct speech as two extremes in social relations. Shaping of human consciousness depends on basic human feelings of love and hate whose denoting, understanding and interpretation is acquired through socialization. This process of shaping is determined by using the words and language in formation of terms and speech. The interiorization of socially allowed ways of using language controls social relations, and enables potential forms of manipulation and expression of power towards others or different people. The purpose of the paper is to shed light on the causal-consequential relationships between these two social phenomena. In the conclusion, we will point out insights on how hate speech and politically correct speech are used as antipodes to cover up the ideological nature of social system.

Keywords: hate speech, politically correct speech, social relationship, interpretation, ideology.

1. Dilemma about the phrase 'hate speech', socialization and causes of hatred

Showing hatred depends on personal experience that is shaped through socialization as learning according to the model of the group to which the individual belongs (family) as well as later experiences through which social learning is learned (peers, media and the wider social environment).[1] It should be noted here that direct contact with a group towards which hatred or animosity is manifested is an important factor that can influence

weaker or stronger verbal expression of aggression and hatred. The question arises as to whether the phrase „hate speech" exists together, given that there is speech as the ability of people to communicate, speech can be: long, boring, interesting, short, etc. Then there is hatred and love as human feelings that can be expressed without speech (sight, movement, etc.). Speech can explain these feelings, grading them as smaller, bigger, biggest, but it cannot be a part of the syntagm literally translated and introduced from English into Serbian language.

Language is a factor of culture, and according to Foucault, „to know, therefore, means to transfer from language to the realm of language; to re-educate the unique field of words and things; to give everything the opportunity to speak. That is, above all features to enable the birth of auxiliary speech - comments. The property of language is neither in seeing nor in proving but in interpretation" (Foucault, 1971: 106). Speech should reflect the state of the procedural character of the production and rounding of thought, which contains the quality, quantity and density of words used in the process. In that sense, it should differ from statements that are precise formulations in which some terms are connected in a certain way in order to provide information about a phenomenon.

Social behaviour means the behaviour of an individual in society, which arises as a consequence of primary and secondary socialization in order to adapt to social values and prepare individuals for life in the wider community and society. During life, an individual comes into various social situations that include other people, groups of people, organizations and institutions. Fromm understood the notion of social character as the core of the character structure that is common to most members of the same culture and in contrast to the individual character by which people belonging to the same culture differ from each other (Fromm, 1983).

Socialization as a process includes the formation of personality within the framework of restraining primary instincts, which include aggressive instinct also. One of the definitions of aggressive behaviour in social psychology is that it „implies behaviour that is intended to harm or injure someone else ‒regardless of how that behaviour occurred (whether there was an intention from the beginning to hurt someone or it only occurs in the course of reacting to a situation) and regardless of whether it manifests itself in open and visible actions to the detriment of other or only the desire to hurt other remains" (Rot, 1994: 253).

Aggressive behaviour is behaviour that results from hatred as a type of emotion. It is not necessary to define the cause-and-effect relationship between aggression and hatred, but

we can distinguish between aggressive behaviour that manifests itself physically and one that does not take physical form, hatred is an emotion that has both physical and verbal manifestations. In the analysis of frustration and aggression, one of the supporters of Berkovic's frustration theory is that there are innate components of aggressive behaviour, but that experience and learning also influence the manifestation of aggression. The triggers for aggressive reactions are „certain stimuli associated with aggressive reactions" (*ibid.*, 256). The stimuli that lead to aggression and aggressive actions, in fact, provoke hostility, and which stimuli will depend on „personal experience and social learning" (Berkovic cit. acc. Rot, 1994: 256-257).

One of the definitions of hate speech is that it is speech that expresses hatred towards a certain group of people.[2] Thus, personal experience primarily in the family, and then learning through socialization in the wider social environment shapes the relationship with others, and if an individual breaks away from, for example, a negative parental attitude towards some other social group, the first negative event with that target group brings him back to that (old) framework.

The process of socialization includes internalization „adoption of certain principles of behaviour determined by society and social agents as permanent own rules of behaviour", and this term includes inhibition „when it comes to refraining from manifesting impulses whose manifestation society considers undesirable or refraining from learned and socially undesirable behaviour's", and together they represent behaviours that are practiced „not due to external pressure but for internal reasons" (Rot, 1994: 103). In this way, behavioural habits (and verbal expression) are formed in accordance with social norms and requirements.

2. Use of lie, politically correct speech and dialogue

Kant wrote that „lying is the rejection and, as it were, the annihilation of one's own human dignity. A man who himself does not believe what he tells others (even if he is an ideal person) has even less value than if it were just a thing; because its ability to benefit something yet it can be used by someone else, since it is something real and given; but, communicating your thoughts to someone else, using words that still (intentionally) contain the opposite of what the speaker thinks, is a purpose that is precisely opposed to the natural purposefulness of his power to communicate his thoughts, i.e. renunciation of his own personality and only the apparent appearance of man, not man himself" (Kant,

---

[2] Definition of hate speech: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hate%20speech.

Constant, 2008: 58). Therefore, „in order for a lie (in the ethical sense of the word), as a deliberate untruth in general, declared that it is for rejection, it is not necessary to be harmful to others, because then it would be a violation of the rights of others" (Kant, Constant, 2008: 58).

Correction of critical spirit in the framework of politically correct speech implies the absence of principles and „every circumstance invokes only the principle that is inherent in it, because the essence of the principle is not to be general and applicable in many cases, but to be permanent, and this quality organizes its essence so well that it is in it that all its usefulness is permanently located" (Kant, Constant, 2008: 27).

The attribute politically in the phrase politically correct speech also reflects the content of this speech as a product of the ideology of the social system, among other things because „morality is much deeper knowledge than politics, since the need for morality is more than everyday and the spirit of men is more devoted to him, and in addition, its direction was not falsified by the personal interests of the commissioner or usurper of power" (Kant, Constant, 2008: 32).

Politically correct speech and hate speech have a similar function, their use is not to argue what is the meaning of social relations, but to completely suppress a different ideological attitude. The similarity between these two types of language use in speech is that both arise as a result of emotions - one out of hatred and the other out of love. The way to deny an understanding of thought is to shorten someone's speech or label certain words in speech by taking them out of context in an individual's written or oral expression and reducing them to a few short words or statements. This way of interpretation is especially characteristic of the sensationalist space of the media in which short statements are considered speech, which they are not, considering that speech implies the beginning, elaboration and final word about a person or a social phenomenon. In that sense, we have, for example, introductory speech, funeral speech, and other speeches that are prepared for different social occasions. Speeches can be shorter or longer, but they are certainly not in the form of just one or two sentences, that is, short statements. Although the role of the media is important in the presentation of certain social phenomena if superficially and ambivalently unilaterally limited to the presentation of short forms of human verbal expression, then the role of the media is an integral part of the mechanism of ideological nature of the social system.

The emergence of politically correct speech can also be viewed from the angle of inhibiting freedom of speech. Within the need for expression, our attitude towards the

verbal implies the dissemination of thoughts and knowledge that is done through the process of (self) criticism. Analysing what criticism is, Barthes states that „criticism is by no means a review of results or a collection of judgments, it is, in essence, an activity, that is, string of intellectual acts, deeply involved in the historical and the subjective (it is the same) existence of the one who performs them, namely takes them over" (Barthes, 1979: 164).

In that sense, when politically correct speech occurs as a result of hate speech, it should include the aforementioned factors that a critique contains, that is, it should not consist of short phrases that want to be conveyed to the listener without content and points, often making the use of language and speech meaningless. For, „language in itself is neither true nor false, it is valid or it is not: valid, that is, it represents a coherent system of signs", and „criticism is speech about speech; it is a *second degree* language or *metalanguage* (as logicians would say), which is developed in the basic language (or *object-language*)"(*ibid*.).

Politically correct speech is shrouded in a social halo of truth and mysticism, because its content is believed without explaining the arguments and thinking about the views that are represented in it. Claims of politically correct speech are taken for granted as the pure essence of meaning and values. The social system also marked a set of signs, language as the content and determinants of hate speech and politically correct speech as the antipode. In that way, politically correct speech is protected by the social system by a convention of unquestionable social value, which, in fact, conceals its ideological meaning.

Is it possible to establish a dialogue between hate speech and politically correct speech?

Dialogue involves having an oral or written conversation, in which the actors are emotionally involved based on knowledge, ideas and attitudes. It is a social relationship that involves respecting the personalities of the participants and their differences. It should be based on freedom of thought and creative expression of the views of the actors in the dialogue. However, the limited power of dialogue is that it takes place through the symbolic and actual use of words in different social contexts, which has different consequences for the social groups that use them (Vuković, 2017: 218). Only in dialogue as a form of two-way verbal communication do individuals enter into a social relationship that serves to test their attitudes. However, dialogue is reduced to a formal form of behaviour because „the relationship of one individual with another has lost the mark of immediacy and humanity, and has gained the mark of manipulation and instrumentality"

(Fromm, 1983: 113), and in the modern world it implies the manifestation of the power of individuals who occupy the highest positions of social power.

3. Forms of social determinism as conditions for shaping verbal expressionandthe language of human rights ideology

The category of causes in determinism has a dynamic and specific meaning because causal factors are „basic and most dynamic parts of deterministic systems, their examination contributes most to a deeper understanding of determinism in some area of reality" (Milić, 1996: 643-644). The emergence of hate speech and politically correct speech can be partly explained through the role of psychic determinism as an integral part of social determinism. Within psychic determinism, consciousness appears as a specific feature of man and his actions, and „everything related to mutual communication, without which there is no social activity, the participation of individuals in that activity, individual motives, goals, plans, is subject to some laws of psychic (...) specific psychological characteristics arise under the strong influence of social circumstances, especially if their action is observed in longer historical periods in which cultural tradition and social mentality are formed. Society and some of its collective parts have unusually powerful means by which various human psychic traits can be shaped and developed in various directions, but these influences are mostly achieved through specific psychic determinisms" (*ibid*., 644-645).

The cultural sphere within social determinism has several important layers in society that could influence hate speech and politically correct speech. The first layer is cognitive-orientational, which consists of „knowledge and assumptions about reality, as well as closely related value assessments of certain parts of reality and activities". The second layer includes tradition, ethical, legal norms and customs, and it performs a normative-integrative function through institutional mechanisms of internal social supervision. And the third, aesthetic-expressive layer in which are „all man's attempts to express his own life experience and the reality in which he lives through his conception of beauty" (*ibid.,* 646).

As part of social determinism culture through these three layers actually enables the creation of knowledge about oneself and others, the development of creative thought, and better social integration, which together can be one of the ways to create conditions in which there are no causes for negative emotions such as hatred, and enabling of shaping 'mature' social correctness and tolerance different from (ideologically) imposed one.

The origin of hate speech, and especially politically correct speech, can be found in how Douzinas explains the changes in the modern world and individual consciousness. Namely, in the modern world there have been radical changes „an individual, freed from tradition, history and community becomes the foundation and principle of social and political organization. The natural hierarchy of the classical world is replaced by a mobile and dynamic social order in which, according to Marx's famous phrase 'everything that is solid dissolves in the air'. Duty is replaced by individual rights, good is separated from morality because, while the classical world first defines what is good, and then derives morality and legal duties from that definition, for modern man, good follows law. To be right means to act freely, subjecting moral, state law to personal interests" (Douzinas, 2009: 61).

Considering the question of the language of human rights ideology, he states that „the choice of names and epithets in describing phenomena (empire, imperialism, cosmopolitanism) is not innocent. Naming as such contains strong normative and political choices, the act of appointment" (*ibid.*, 196). The advantage of the concepts and values that form the basis of the new world order is their elasticity seen in their greater abstractness and vagueness, so that „values can be expanded or narrowed in line with current priorities, potentially problematic rights can be rejected by invoking their opposition" (*ibid.*, 240).

Conclusion remarks

The elucidation of the causal-consequential relationship between social phenomena is enabled on the basis of observation and analysis of their similarities and differences. The definition and criteria for assessing what is politically correct speech and what constitutes hate speech is determined by the social group that accumulates social power. Thus, the shaping of language and speech is a consequence of the structure of ideological speech determined by the interests of the group and where value assessments must not be negative (as in the case of pre-marked politically correct speech), and the supreme principle based on determining the meaning and interpretation is to protect the interests of a more powerful social group without introducing argumentation. Therefore, the conditionality of truth depends on the subject who claims and verbally expresses it, and not on the universal principle of impartiality. Are we coming to a humanistic model of discourse or an ideology of imposed speeches / stories? Politically correct speech ends in absurdity and paradox because it is only everything that is not hate speech. As two extremes, hate speech and politically correct are used as antipodes to cover up the ideological nature of the social system because they make it impossible to present

arguments, the critical power of thinking and judging, and the establishment of a social relationship in a dialogue.

References

Barthes, R. (1979) Literature, Mythology, Semiology. Beograd: Nolit. [In Serbian]

Douzinas, C. (2009) Human Rights and Empire. The political philosophy of cosmopolitanism. Beograd: Službeni glasnik. [In Serbian]

Foucault, M. (1971) The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. Beograd: Nolit. [In Serbian]

Fromm, E. (1983) Escape from Freedom. Beograd: Nolit. [In Serbian]

Hatespeech definition available at:

https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/hate%20speech, 02.03.2022.

Kant, I., Constant B. (2008) The Right to Lie. Beograd: Službeni glasnik. [In Serbian]

Milić, V. (1996) Sociological method. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva. [In Serbian]

Rot, N. (1994) Fundamentals of Social Psychology. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva. [In Serbian]

Vuković, A. (2017) „Dialogue as a Manifestation of Power" in Grk. S (ed.): The World and Serbia – Challenges and Temptations. Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, pp. 215-228. [In Serbian]

***

Ana Vuković[*]

GOVOR MRŽNJE VS. POLITIČKI KOREKTAN GOVOR: UZROČNO-POSLEDIČNE VEZE

Apstrakt: U radu se razmatraju govor mržnje i politički korektan govor kao dva ekstrema u društvenim odnosima. Oblikovanje ljudske svesti zavisi od osnovnih ljudskih osećanja ljubavi i mržnje čije označavanje, razumevanje i tumačenje se stiče socijalizacijom. Ovaj proces oblikovanja determiniše upotreba reči i jezika u formiranju pojmova i govoru. Interiorizacija društveno dozvoljenih načina upotrebe jezika vrši kontrolu društvenih odnosa, i omogućava potencijalne oblike manipulacije i ispoljavanja moći prema drugima ili drugačijima. Cilj rada je da osvetlimo uzročno-posledične veze između ove dve društvene pojave. U zaključku ćemo izložiti zapažanja o tome kako se govor mržnje i politički korektan govor koriste kao antipodi za prikrivanje ideološke prirode društvenog sistema.

[*] Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd (Srbija), e-mail: annvukovic@yahoo.com

Ključne reči: govor mržnje, politički korektan govor, društveni odnos, tumačenje, ideologija.