the communication of
hate

Michael Waltman & John Haas

Chapter 1

Language in Action: Overview of Discursive Constructs Useful for Understanding Hate Speech

Hatred and related constructs, such as tolerance, are controversial and ambiguous for a variety of reasons. First, the many academics working in this area represent several disciplines and often work at the nexus of those disciplines, providing a rich and diverse set of ideas for understanding hate and hate-related issues. This is useful for academic writers but it could hinder the development of a commonly understood core set of constructs and practices that might characterize the work of a single academic discipline.

Second, there is frequently a disconnect between what academics mean by constructs such as "hate" and "tolerance" and how those terms are understood and discussed in our everyday lives. As we have described earlier (Waltman & Haas, 2007), for example, people may claim to hate the boss that bullies them with their power, the former friend who betrayed the secrets of their friendship to a third party, or the colleague who frustrates the accomplishment of their professional goals. A child may claim to hate a classmate who "tattled" on him to a teacher. A politician from one political party may claim that the rhetoric of politicians from another political party constitutes hate speech against the former.

How does one reconcile such everyday understandings and uses of the term "hate" with the more extraordinary hate-motivated actions of the White Supremacist that unleashed automatic weapon fire on a Jewish Day Care Center in an attempt to kill Jewish children before they could mature to become an adult threat to the Aryan race? How do some of the everyday uses of the term "hate" compare with Timothy McVeigh's belief that the Federal Government was infiltrated and controlled by an international Jewish conspiracy (Zionist-Occupied Government) and who viewed his bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City as a righteous act of self-defense? The use of the term "hate" to describe such a wide range of emotions and actions could certainly interfere with a meaningful academic

understanding of the term. Therefore, we define "hate" and describe what we mean by the term.

Hate is generally understood as extreme negative feelings and beliefs held about a group of individuals or a specific representative of that group because of their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or sexual orientation (Perry, 2001). As he studied hatred, Aristotle felt it important to distinguish hatred from anger. Anger is an emotion that (a) one might have for an individual (not a larger social group), (b) does not prevent one from having sympathy for the objects of one's anger, (c) is usually the result of personal insult or injury, and (d) is likely to promote impetuous action (Olson, 2002; Sokolon, 2006; R. K. Whillock, 1995). Because hatred is an emotion that one feels for a social group, hatred, unlike anger, need not be the result of personal injury or insult and is more likely to prompt deliberate action. Unlike anger, the hateful mind is not capable of sympathy but hopes for evil to befall the hated (Sokolon, 2006). Indeed, the hateful mind would have the objects of its hatred simply perish—the ultimate end for the mind that has learned to hate. Because the hateful mind lacks sympathy, Aristotle viewed hatred as a much more durable emotion than anger, unlikely to dissipate over time or to even be satiated by killing (Sokolon, 2006). So, one is more likely to feel "anger" toward a friend who betrays us. The friendship may never be the same, but the anger is likely to dissipate over time and most of us would not wish that the former friend would "disappear."

It is also important to understand that hatred is an emotion in which one may find pleasure (Hazlitt, 2005). William Hazlitt (2005) suggested a variety of ways that hatred brings us pleasure. First, the fundamentalism and certitude of hatred offers the pleasure and indulgence in self-righteousness. Our hatred of a specific group is enlivened by our construction of that group as an enemy. Inevitably, the enemy is constructed as evil and/or fundamentally flawed. Understanding ourselves as the dual opposite of this evil and flawed enemy allows us to wallow in our own goodness and righteousness. Second, Hazlitt viewed hatred as a destructive, actually primitive, emotion that had to be repressed as humans exchanged their tribal bonds for the bonds of civilized societies (remember, we hate groups/tribes or their representatives); however, we find pleasure in revisiting this darker side of our human nature in our imaginations. Perhaps we revisit this "darker side" when we consume movies and books that vilify old war enemies. Perhaps we even revisit hatred and pantomime this hatred through our allegiances to sports teams and the rivals we love to hate. As we will see in chapter five, it is easy to imagine that ethno-terrorists and perpetrators of hate crimes take great pleasure in the pain that they inflict on the objects of their hatred.

Hate speech may be used for many purposes and may have different intended consequences. Hate speech may be directed to intimidate an out-group. However, hate speech may also be used to influence the behavior of in-group members in a variety of ways (e.g., to recruit members to a hate group, to socialize white people to adopt and understand the proper racist Aryan identity and behaviors, to find pleasure in hatred, or to promote ethnoviolence). Hate speech is used to accomplish a variety of other goals that we discuss in the following chapters. What will become clear is that *hate comes alive in our language and our actions*.

With this understanding of hatred, we will now provide an overview of the remaining chapters in this book. This text is focused on understanding the language of hate in action. How does this language function? What does it accomplish? What are interlocutors attempting to "do" when they appeal to the hatred of an audience? The answers to these questions may be clearly addressed by an examination of the communicative messages produced by those with hateful minds. Hate speech is used to intimidate minorities, to promote ethnoviolence, to contribute to an ideology of hate (and, more generally, a collective memory that constitutes the worldview of racist Aryans), to solidify the in-group against an out-group, and to recruit new members into the organized hate movement.

Chapter two focuses on the discursive nature and organization of hate groups. Hate speech certainly operates in sectors of society beyond the rhetoric of organized hate groups, as we discuss in chapters five and six; however, hate organizations are important for their ideological work that often resonates throughout other societal contexts. Chapter two can be thought of as offering a sociological overview of organized hate groups in the United States. We describe a web of relationships between groups that can be distinguished by the symbols and images that may be observed in their communication and hate speech. Generally, we distinguish between race religion groups (groups that ground their hatred in a specific religious viewpoint) and secular hate groups (groups that primarily ground their hatred in a view of group relations and secular beliefs). Importantly, we discuss the ways that these groups have networked and become more integrated and co-opted one another's symbols and images.

In this chapter, we discuss the most recent incarnation of the ideology of hate. This ideology is important as it provides substance and reason to hatred. This is important work because the ideology of hate has tended to evolve as leaders change and groups fade in significance while other groups grow in importance.

Chapter three addresses the conceptual properties of hate speech. These properties center on the discursive construction of social differences in negative and highly politicized terms. One such discursive construct is the hate stratagem (R. K. Whillock, 1995). The hate stratagem, as described above, is a rhetorical trick that discourages argumentative engagement and reasoning. Instead, the hate stratagem politicizes social differences in order to accomplish some specific social or political goal. We review research on the hate stratagem and extend this work by examining the operation of the hate stratagem in different artifacts of the hate movement (e.g., in the racist novels *Hunter* and *The Turner Diaries*). Other discursive constructs discussed in chapter four include message-induced heuristic processing of hate material. Heuristics are decisional shortcuts that people employ to process social influence messages. Examples of such heuristics include the credibility heuristic (I should comply with this request because the speaker is credible or an expert), the consensus heuristic (I should comply because other people are complying), and the liking heuristic (I should comply because this person is likeable). Several heuristics are discussed in chapter three. Some research indicates that hateful messages are often accompanied by attempts to encourage listeners to process such messages superficially and heuristically.

Social differences are also politicized through the exchanging of myths that constitute the collective memory of the U.S. hate movement. The myths discussed in chapter three functions to teach proper racist Aryan identities, beliefs, and actions (including violence). They also teach Aryans how to think about and treat their enemies. Chapter three extends previous work on racist Aryan myths by illustrating their existence and functions across the most important discursive artifacts in the U.S. hate movement.

Although not a discourse structure, we argue that hate crime often carries important symbolic value. Hate crime has sometimes been referred to as a message crime. A form of terrorism and ethnoviolence, hate-motivated crime and violence communicate a variety of meanings to those who share an identity with the target of the hate crime. Hate crime and ethnoviolence communicates that the other is not welcome and not safe ("this could have been you"). It is this symbolic value that makes hate crimes unlike any other crime, one that tears at the fabric of communities.

Chapter four examines the role the Internet plays in the hate speech produced by hate-mongers. It was not too long ago that if hate-mongers wanted to gather to create congenial environments they would have to travel, often long distances, to secluded compounds in remote areas. Now, for the price of an inexpensive computer, software, and Internet server, they may enter a world where their ideas are normal and respected. It is clear that these con-

genial environments have played an important role in the radicalization of individuals who go "Lone Wolf" and take it upon themselves to commit horrific acts of hate-motivated violence. This chapter examines several key Web Pages to illustrate how hate speech is used to radicalize readers and promote Lone Wolf terrorism.

Chapters five and six examine samples of hate speech in two mainstream contexts that will resonate with the experiences of readers. In chapter five, we examine hate speech and hate crimes that are directed at immigrants who have entered this country illegally. "Nativism" reflects beliefs and policies that favor established groups in a country and discriminate against "newcomers" or immigrants. In the 19th century, Nativism was a powerful force in American life and politics, as being 100% American meant being white, Protestant, and American-born. American fear of Europeans (and, often, Catholics) fleeing economic and agricultural catastrophes in Europe are widely discussed in American history textbooks. We examine current Nativist discourse that has been used to whip audiences into frenzies by making undocumented immigrants (usually people of color) the repository for all the ills and fears of working-class and middle-class white people. We examine this discourse and identify it as a form of hate speech with important conceptual overlap with the discourse produced by the organized hate movement in the United States. As we note in chapter five, recent years have seen a 40% increase in hate-motivated violence carried out against people in this country without proper documentation. Not surprisingly, this violence has been accompanied by increasingly vitriolic hate speech among politicians and media pundits.

In chapter six, we examine how this Nativism emerged in the discourse produced by the key campaigns of the 2008 presidential election. We describe how the Hillary Clinton campaign gradually devolved into explicit attempts to "otherize" Barack Obama by constructing him as insufficiently American. Over time, this strategy would reveal the production of the hate stratagem and the suggestion that "hard-working, white Americans" would be unwilling to vote for an African American nominee, a suggestion that would be rejected by the voters. In the general election, the McCain campaign would employ rhetoric that resembled that of many hate groups. The McCain campaign employed the hate stratagem and explicitly invoked cultural myths that have been used to vilify African Americans throughout history. This discourse did not fade into the background of our political landscape when Barack Obama was elected President of the United States. Instead, this discourse morphed from simple hate speech that attempted to otherize Barack Obama for his blackness, to otherizing him for both his un-

American attitudes and his "non-American citizenship." Groups such as the
Birthers and Tea Party protestors responded to the Obama administration's
policies by calling him a Kenyan, Hitler, a Fascist, a Communist, etc. These
protests during the summer of 2009 would see the reemergence of militia
groups, popular in the 1990s, that cloaked their hatred in suspicion of the
government and conspiratorial beliefs that government wishes to take away
American's Second Amendment rights in order to take away Americans' lib-
erties. In the summer of 2009, militia groups would coalesce with Birthers
and Tea Party protestors to make a potentially violent cocktail of anti-
government Nativists (Potok, 2009). We discuss the implications of the re-
turn of the militias and their violence that defined so much of the 1990s.

Chapter seven explores the desirable features of anti-hate discourse, dis-
course designed to respond to hate and promote more humane and tolerant
communities. We reconsider the purposes and functions of hate and hate
speech in order to articulate the desired functions of anti-hate discourse. Spe-
cifically, we argue that anti-hate discourse should reconstruct what was de-
stroyed through hate. Hate crimes represent attempts to destroy the body and
identity of its victims. Hate speech vilifies and dehumanizes the identities it
targets. So, one important function of anti-hate speech is to re-humanize and
revalue the identities destroyed through hate speech. An anti-hate discourse
explicitly describes the value and preciousness of the identities demeaned by
hate speech. In this chapter, we identify a set of best practices that we
gleaned from a close reading of various anti-hate texts such as documenta-
ries, Web Pages, and pamphlets. We warn of potential pitfalls in the con-
struction of messages intended to challenge hate. For example, we note that a
community's desire to promote a desired self-image may lead to scapegoat-
ing specific hate criminals, making them a vessel into which a community's
shortcomings may be poured. Such community identity management strate-
gies may prevent reflection on community characteristics that grow hatred
(Williamson, 2002).

The basic thrust of these anti-hate texts is on how one may respond to
specific, often interpersonal, encounters with family, friends, and acquaint-
ances. The hateful acts depicted in most of these materials also involve rather
explicit acts of hatred. This chapter also focuses on the everyday discourses
that support and sustain hatred. While previous chapters addressed the hate,
hate crime, and hate speech produced by individual hate-mongers or hate
groups, in this chapter we also examine the ways that hatred is manipulated
by elements of mainstream society. This Everyday Racism focuses on the
ways that broad social discourses produced by police, politicians, and every-
day citizens knowingly and unknowingly contribute to a more hateful and

fragmented society. These forms of racism may "otherize softly" (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) but still promote hatred. We discuss this Everyday Racism as a form of racism that exists in people's everyday interactions and serves to maintain white privilege. Subsequently, we describe ways that this form of racism may be challenged and confronted.

Finally, chapter eight serves to conclude our discussion of the discursive production of hatred. We consider the implications of the issues discussed and offer suggestions that may shepherd us to more hopeful and humane communities that offer unity in differences.

One important feature of this book is the universality of hatred. Hatred is an international problem that results in isolated acts of murder and more systematic and coordinated genocide. Our writing and our examples are skewed toward American society because that is our focus. We think it is important that readers keep in mind that hatred is a problem that knows no geographical boundaries, and that the American version of hatred must certainly have implications for the hatred experienced by other societies.

We believe the themes discussed in these chapters provide a rather unique view of hate speech in action. The chapters in this book offer a comprehensive examination of how hatred operates in American society. We examine the discourse of various organized hate groups, including the ways that common symbols, images, and icons serve to integrate various groups in the hate movement. We also examine how hatred is manipulated by mainstream politicians, political operatives, and media pundits to pursue the advancement of their own agendas. This analysis allows us to compare the discourse of organized hate groups with these mainstream public voices. This comparison will reveal that these voices are often more alike than they are different. Our analysis of hate-motivated discourse in American society also allows a glimpse at the various technologies that make hate speech available to mass publics (e.g., physical books, television commercials, newspaper and news magazine reports, Internet Web Pages). Another unique feature of this text is our analysis of the desirable features of a discourse that promotes tolerance. We believe this to be a unique attribute among books that examine hatred. The importance of this chapter is given weight by an example of anti-hate discourse, discussed in chapter five, that violated important principles of the anti-hate discourse discussed in chapter seven, resulting in unfortunate consequences for specific individuals and the community they wished to protect.