

Hate Speech as a Mechanism to Siege and Construct Identity

خطاب الكراهية كآلية لصناعة وتسييج الهوية

Korichi Abdelhak **

Lab. Le FEU, Kasdi Merbah University, Ouargla (Algeria), korichi.abdelhak@uni-ouargla.dz

Dr. Ghounane Nadia

Dr Moulay Tahar University Saida, (Algeria), nadoushben@ymail.com

Received: 21/02/2023

Accepted: 31/05/2023

Published: 07/06/2020

Abstract:

In the age of globalization, boundaries, and borders have become fluid and resilient. Interaction and coexistence among society members have been imperative. The exchange of society members necessitates the interaction of various identity components. Group-based identities feel the urgent and sincere need to shield and siege their identity; Hate Speech can, and has been used as a way to reach such ends. It influences the sense of belonging, in individuals, and societies. The study at hand aims at exploring how Hate Speech forms dissent identities out of larger sociological structures, and how it can be used to shield them. The study also attempts to show how Hate Speech is manifested in society as a consequence of sociological factors and what results from these consequences. Sensing ways out of social conflict, as a consequence of Hate Speech, has suggested legislative procedures, as a study reveals in the conclusion.

Keywords: Hate speech; identity, society; construction of identity; imagined identity.

ملخص:

ساهم مجتمع العولمة بحدوده السائلة والمفتوحة في زيادة مساحة وفضاءات التواصل بين المكونات الاجتماعية؛ في المقابل زاد الاحتكاك بين الهويات وتدافع الانتماءات الفرعية ومصالحها من خطاب الكراهية وتحوله لوعي سلبي وممارسات. تسعى الدراسة لرصد دور خطاب الكراهية في خلق هويات انشقاقية خاصة وآليات توظيف هذا الخطاب في تسييج الهويات وصناعة الحيز المتخيل وفصل المجموعات كما تحاول الدراسة البحث في الأسباب الاجتماعية المؤدية لظهور هذا الخطاب عبر البحث في جذوره، ورصد تداعياته على الصعيد الاجتماعي و الفردي/النفسي و مدى تأثيره على الهويات وعلى مسألة الانتماء كما يهدف البحث لتحسس مسارات الخروج من أزمة الكراهية وتفكيك تداعياتها السلبية تخلص الدراسة الى ضرورة دمج الهويات الفرعية في تركيبة المجتمع من خلال صهر فكرة الانشقاقية عن طريق اهداف حضارية تساهم في بناء وحدة و كيان الدولة من خلال استقراء بعض اراء المفكرين واليات تطبيقها و تجسيدها.

*
Corresponding author.

كلمات مفتاحية: خطاب الكراهية, صناعة الهوية, الحيز المتخيل, الهويات الانشاقاقية, التركيبة المجتمعية.

I- Introduction:

The Floyd incident on May 25th that took place in the U.S.A proved that societies are yet to struggle with ethnic minorities, Hate Speech, and Hate Crimes. The U.S. Department of Justice released statistics that show an increase in Hate Crime by 62% in 2020. Most of the crimes committed show “the offenders’ bias toward race, ethnicity and ancestry, which continues to be the most considerable bias motivation”. It does not, then, strike anybody as a surprise that Hate Speech has been a concern for so social psychologists, philosophers and researchers. Hate Speech shapes the identity of groups as it shows how a group of people perceive other groups, against whom Hate Speech is directed. It also shows how boundaries amongst groups are drawn, imaginatively so. As a result, conflict and aim for high office never cease, particularly when considering the history of oppressed minorities whose oppression resides as a memory in their consciousness. Such memories form an attitudinal reference point for interacting with others.

The current paper deals with how Hate Speech forms and shields identity by considering both ends of it; the utterer of hate Speech and the receiver of it. The approach adopted in this study relies on social psychologists’ findings and insights, primarily because Hate Speech clashes with the sensitivity of the receiver and drives him/her to behave in a certain manner or, at least, take a stance towards what he is exposed to. Furthermore, Hate Speech manifests itself as the incarnation of the inner feelings towards the other, as the first step towards Hate Crime.

Resolutions for Hate Speech end up with groups requesting legislative procedures to minimize Hate Speech towards groups. It is a resolution that one believes, goes in counter to Freedom of Speech. This study concludes with recommendations on how to bridge the gap between group-based identities, as bias and prejudice seem or is posited to be biologically engrained in people. Despite the efforts to reconciliations amongst group-based identities, conflicts seem to burst at the smallest possible cause. Individuals seem to have a motif for violence towards other groups, and sensibility towards their own sense of identification. Hate Speech serves as a defensive and offensive mechanism.

The current paper is rather a contribution to the literature on Hate Speech; it has been years since Hate Speech has been challenged. Therefore, contemplating what, so far, has been accomplished and building on the available literature helps move one step further and establish solid theoretical grounds for its production and ways out of it. The study aims to reach its aims by answering the following questions; 1) what is the impetus for Hate Speech? 2) How can Hate Speech be utilized? 3) What is the immediate influence on group-based identities? 4) What are the ways out of Hate Speech?

II –Hate Speech and Imagined Boundaries:

The United Nations defines, though admittedly term slips defining, Hate Speech as "any kind of communication in speech, writing or behaviour, that attacks or uses pejorative or discriminatory language concerning a person or a group on the basis of who they are, in other words, based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, colour, descent, gender or other identity factors." (UN, 2019, p. 2) Moreover, the document that the United Nations issued in May considered Hate Speech as a menace to democracy. More to a point, Hate Speech cannot be regarded as a crime. The United Nations document says:

Rather than prohibiting hate speech as such, international law prohibits the incitement to discrimination, hostility, and violence (referred to here as ‘incitement’). Incitement is a very dangerous form of speech because it explicitly and deliberately aims at triggering discrimination, hostility and violence, which may also lead to or include terrorism or atrocity crimes. Hate speech that does not reach the threshold of incitement is not something that international law requires States to prohibit. It is important to underline that even when not prohibited, hate speech may be harmful. (p. 2)

The Council of Europe alluded to Hate Speech as "Hate speech is insidious and should never be underestimated. As the Assembly states, it dehumanises the individuals and groups it targets, making them more vulnerable to stigmatisation, discrimination and violence" (Council of Europe, 2021, p. 38).

Hate speech, *per se*, as a phenomenon, presents a final phase of interacting variables which makes it a discourse. The latter serves as a means to reach objectives well beyond the mere articulation of speech expressing hate. As is the case with any discourse, Hate Speech has a code, participants (addresser and addressee), an aim, and influence. Scrutinizing Hate Speech and breaking down its constituents may assuredly assist our understanding of it and the role it plays in forming and sieging an identity. It is a possibility that we can arrive at how Hate Speech constitutes the collective consciousness of people and even conducts behavioural patterns. Social constructionists argue that "group-based identity arises not from any particular traits, but from social meanings which are created by words and actions of others". (Seamon, 2008, p. 100). That is, Hate Speech makes groups of people aware of their difference from other groups, and aware of the opinionated perspectives towards them; consequently, their identity components become primed.

It is worth noting that the occurrence of Hate Speech necessarily entails the existence of an identity component that constitutes the character of a group of people at which feelings of contempt and abhorrence are openly expressed. Such a group of people exists within a larger sociological structure, a structure that includes sub-identities. Therefore, the likelihood of interaction with "other" identities increases. Group-based identities interact with other opposing, minor identities, resulting in an "us" and "them" dichotomy. To complicate matters further, group-based identities interact with their initial identity component to reassure that their identity continues to survive. It follows from that that Hate Speech, directed towards groups as a means of interaction, communicates internally and externally. It externally communicates with other opposing identities. It also internally communicates the consciousness of people belonging to a certain group, by negotiating its particular

components, reassuring its boundaries, and insisting on matters of difference, privacy, and even privilege (from other groups).

Amartya Sen (2006, p. 96) believes that powerful feelings arise from the sense of belonging to a group of people. Such feelings carry within them an awareness of distance and difference from other groups. Interestingly, the affection and solidarity that individuals of the same groups have for each other are likely to stir and fuel repugnancy towards other groups. Hate speech constructs minor identities as inferior and subordinated.

It can be noted, therefore, that identity is dynamic and transformative as yields to the context in which it occurs. It can also be noted that speech towards an identity has considerable value, particularly when speech towards a group of people constructs its identity by drawing the boundaries and asserting the elements of difference and distance from other groups. Hate speech, therefore, creates new dissociative identities that are separate from the larger sociological structure. Each new group-based identity emphasizes difference from other groups, a state which is likely to lead to contempt and hatred towards the other, indeed any other/s; it is also likely to lead to what Scott (1990) referred to as “hidden transcripts”.

Hidden transcripts refer to beliefs held by groups of people but are dominated and repressed by the dominating class. Power relations render these beliefs minor, subordinate, and not worthwhile. Hidden transcripts will likely take a form of action, provided that an opportunity arises. Hidden transcripts are constant throughout time, repressed; they are historical, accumulative, and have culminated in the consciousness of a group of people as a memory. That hidden transcripts (identity, political opportunities, etc.) reside in the consciousness of groups correlates negatively with the previous experiences of groups of people or even with the current situation. Smelser believes that structural conduciveness is a phase where there is an occasion for action, the transformation from memory to actions re-instills and re-establishes the identity components of groups of people, and it establishes a new experience that strengthens distinctiveness from other groups.

The Saudi-Arabian critic and professor of literary theory at Riyadh University, Abdullah Al-Ghodami (1946) maintained that the transcripts mentioned above may not only be hidden but rather deadly because group-based identities define themselves in opposition to other groups. Deadly transcripts, such as they are, are consumed by individuals of a particular group, and experience renders them an integral part of their identity components/identity markers. Worse, such transcripts may justify violence (towards other groups), riots and outbursts, chiefly if such groups aim at avoiding oppression. Individuals of group-based identities develop a discourse that shields/sieges their identity, glorifies their group, and exaggeratedly undermines the value of other groups. As a consequence, Hate Speech becomes a means to construct an identity, newly separated from the larger sociological structure; it can as well be a means to shield an identity and stress difference and distance. Social psychologist Leon Festinger argues that individuals behave differently when they are with groups with which they self-identify. When individuals are “submerged in the group”, they “experience the relaxation of inhibition and feel more anonymous”, a state that he referred to as “deindividuation”. That is, individuals lose themselves to the groups with which they identify, a psychological status that results in heightened sensitivity towards their group.

Another factor may foster and motivate dissociative identities to be constructed. Injustice may most likely be a direct cause for group-based identities to seek recognition, equality, and justice. Women, for instance, have long sought freedom and independence.

What drove them to aim for movements at different levels, social, political, and societal, was the injustice they suffered from their male counterpart. Another factor may be the very realization that the individual is a social construct, the political forces impose a particular order of things; only counter-discourse may assist in restoring equilibrium. Free Speech tolerant regimes pave the way for dissociative identities to express their thoughts and feelings openly; it is exceedingly unlikely that any form of resistance may occur in totalitarian governments.

Le Bon (1841) believed that words gain power from the images they stir and provoke in people's minds, not their literal meaning. Therefore, ambiguous concepts are the ones likely to stir emotions and initiate praxis. Civil society organizations, workplace environments, and universities create atmospheres where group-based identities meet and break the ice to fight a common enemy; institutionalization or indoctrination.

Group-based identities may find in public gatherings, demonstrations, and civil rights activities confluence where they encounter commonalities shared across groups, through slogans and speech by which they address authorities.

An outcome such as that referred to earlier may be regarded as a loss of control, where the group-based identity will be fused and decomposed within the larger sociological structure. Identity markers/components resist meaning negotiation or any sort of compromise or compartmentalization by group-based identities. Therefore, Hate Speech can be utilized and employed to provoke the consciousness of the group, by recalling past painful experiences, cultural trauma, remembering the divisions and conflicts with other groups; these elements send the idea that "our" identity is in danger of extinction and it is the end of our history. Hate Speech sieges/shields and indeed protect identity by reinforcing sub and dissociative identities, despite it being at the expense of homogeneity.

Hate speech, as it so far has been demonstrated, communicates individuals or groups by unifying them around their identity markers; it, then, can congregate people and fuel emotions. It can communicate with others as well, by drawing social and geographical boundaries. Hate Speech, consequently, creates new possible allies and surely enemies.

That Hate Speech constructs identities and shields them; bigotry becomes a means to preserve identity and confront the other. Any encounter with others or with authorities adds value to the consciousness of the group. Neil Smelser coined the term "cultural trauma", which refers to a status where an incident befalls a group-based identity and leaves traces in their consciousness. Such traces reside in the memory of the groups and shape their interaction with the larger sociological structure. It is not the incident per se that affects the group, but rather how it was pictured. Mastering "domination and the arts of resistance" enables groups to have a full grasp of how to reach power and influence.

Power represents a significant form of influence, and control, and aims for group-based identities. If not employed wisely and for objective principles that serve the well-being of society at large, power can be dangerously manipulated for the advantage of narrow ideological frameworks. Power seems to be the last and sole recourse to aim at for group-based identities, particularly if no alternative seems readily available. This may be the reason why power is an arena for competition. Janice Fiamengo wrote a book entitled "Sons of Feminism: Men have their say". She was introduced in a podcast (The Robin Show) in which she said some women simply refused to hire male teachers and hired women only, an incident that was the reason why she wrote the book referred to above. In this particular example,

women identified themselves as a group and chose consciously to provide opportunities for their group instead of following standards and more reasonable approaches to hiring and protecting their sense of identity. Group-based identities justify the pursuit of power and the institutionalization of their ideas by upholding theories of, for instance, Michael Foucault, or interpreting them for their advantage.

III- The Impetus for Hate Speech:

Serious issues at the sociological level manifest themselves as a consequence of Hate Speech. It provokes and threatens the sense of belonging, and it incites hatred against the other to shield/siege identity markers and create imagined boundaries. Hate Speech decomposes and deconstructs the sociological structure way by asserting matters of difference and independence from other groups. Belonging to the group correlates negatively with belonging to a country, and correlates negatively with citizenship. Belonging is confined to the identity markers of that particular group, an adamant sense that emphasizes separation from that which unites all people of a given country.

Hate Speech characterizes social discourse and imprints it with some features that can ostensibly spring from Hate Speech. Group-based identities identify themselves not in terms of what distinguishes them, but rather by denouncing the other for the sheer purpose of valorising their group. Additionally, group-based identities resort to a cultural trauma to which they were exposed to interpret any political decision or social event to avoid being discriminated against; a disposition that blinds them from considering other resolutions to reconcile social discrepancies. Group-based identities regard themselves as being marginalized, inferior, and subordinated; features that characterize their psychological status. Addressing groups with such loaded psychological perceptions means addressing a moral sensitivity rather than a moral sensibility.

Hate Speech incites and results in sequestering group-based identities, a status quo that routinely generates dissent from the shared values of citizenship, of belonging to a large-scale social structure. Citizenship depends heavily on belonging to values that ignore or disparage group-based identities. Hate speech destabilizes the structural unity that authorities supposedly aim to preserve. Authorities allow public gatherings, civil engagement activities, and actions that smelt the “narrow” identification with group-based identities. The interaction with other group-based identities gradually diffuses the sensitivity and the psychological pressure exercised amongst individuals of the group, and it also overrides the typical generalizations that any individual outside the group is a potential hater. It is a kind of generalization that Hate Speech fosters and encourages. Hate Speech makes social gatherings an arena for competition instead of cooperation.

Many critics, political activists, and conservatives argue against identity politics considering, as they believe, the dissenting outcome of it. Given that power has an impact on the construction of individual consciousness, identity politics creates typical perceptions and typical behavioural patterns amongst group-based identities. Groups throw stones at each other, denigrate and defame others; paradoxically, they show great value to their group. Admiring their identity markers, more often than not, results in bigotry and fanaticism; radical perceptions that justify demonizing the other.

Hate Speech, as a manifestation of actual hatred, instantiates conceptualization and preconceptions about the other. Such conceptualizations aim at demonizing the other through

education and indoctrination, mechanisms by which the other is redeemed as inferior, subordinate, and unworthy of exercising their rights. This may be the case because “hate speech creates and perpetuates a poisonous social atmosphere in which minorities are unable to realize genuine equality of citizenship” (Seaman, 2008, p. 2). Such intense “hidden transcripts” impede communication with society members and render any interaction as competition, each group loaded with preconceptions and imagination about the other. Given the constant and mutual dissent and discrimination amongst group-based identities, pressure is exerted on national security and social homogeneity. Groups no longer identify themselves with the shared identity markers of the larger sociological structure; instead, groups feel alienated and marginalized in “no man’s land”. Society no longer manifests its private and unique values, nor values are an extension of its existence. Groups, as aforementioned, resort to power to institutionalize their perception of the other, and instigate a discourse against it as well. According to the BBC4 podcast, Hate Speech against homosexuals in 2016 increased to more than 100 percent, a reason why organizations aim to issue a law against freedom of speech in cases where private beliefs by any means are harassed. Decades ago, women resorted to politics to institutionalize their right to equality of outcome and opportunity.

Allport (1897) introduced a “lasting paradigm” on intergroup relations and scale that measures and detects prejudice occurring in societies. He concluded that prejudice goes through phases, that finally lead to praxis. Groups usually begin by speaking ill of other groups, producing and expressing opinions about other groups based on images and preconceived opinions; Allport refers to this stage as *Antilocution*. *Avoidance*, “the second phase” of the other group begins to manifest, as a means to isolate the prejudiced-against group, which will later be excluded from society. The prejudice against the group will, in the third phase, suffer from *Discrimination*. They will not have equal access to any sort of privilege; politics, social gatherings, administrations, residence in luxurious places, etc. After such discrimination, the situation will aggravate and escalate, and Physical Violence takes place against the hated group. As opinions about the hated groups are sheer images and preconceived notions about them, attacks seem justified. Ethnic cleansing presents the highest form of Extermination. *Extermination* is the last phase where hatred reaches its extremes, as what happened in Bosnia, The Jews, etc.

What is interesting about this phase is that Hate Speech is the onset that inaugurates extreme cases; extermination is not a status to trifle with.

Many social issues, including intergroup relations, arise from bigotry. Social psychologists consider most of the problems amongst group-based identity as mere images and opinions constructed about the other, in most cases false ones. Allport (1979) defined prejudice as “an antipathy based upon faulty and inflexible generalizations” (p. 13). His approach is cognitive in the sense that his analysis is, in his *The Nature of Prejudice*, reduced to personality. He stated that “it is only in the nexus of personality that we find the effective operations of historical, cultural, and economic factors” (p. xvi). Regardless of the critique of Allport’s finest works, according to many social psychologists, as suffering from irreducible complexity, his work does show how Hate Speech (though not a focal point in his book) leads to Hate Crime. Hate Speech is a psychological state that manifests itself in the articulation of hatred expressed openly. Bigotry towards group-based identities characterizes the tense psychological atmosphere after Hate Speech becomes a norm, and a speech that cannot,

psychologically speaking, be kept inwards. Ethnic discrimination, civil wars, and religious conflicts occur in Hate Speech.

Governments engage in severe economic and social issues as a result of group conflicts as openly expressed hatred. Iraq, for instance, still deals with Kurdi, Shia, and Suni conflicts that have devastated the country and people's lives are in jeopardy due to the tensions and history of their aim for power and independence. As a consequence of Hate Speech, group-based identities threaten the homogeneity of social unity as groups openly aim to stand against official authorities because they don't feel they belong or share the values of the sociological structure. Minorities may seek external aid from powers that would hopefully do them justice to exert pressure on authorities. At the level of politics, global forces may resort to oppressed minorities to destabilize the internal social, economic, and political situations. The French philosopher, to provide a case, Roger Garaudy (1913. 2012) gave exhaustive details of how the French government resorted to minorities and officials in Indochina intending to take control of natural resources. The immediate consequences were catastrophic because local regimes conducted illegal drug businesses to provide for the French government. (Garaudy, 1974).

IV –Resolutions and Recommendations:

As the fractions amongst group-based identities widen and conflicts arise, governments resort to sensing ways out of loose identification with imagined conceptions of identity. Radical resolutions at the individual, societal, institutional, administrative, and ideological levels impose themselves so vehemently to polish society out of the damaging effects of Hatred. There is also a dire need to encompass all the varying society members under an umbrella that serves the greater good and well-being of the economy and politics. It is undoubtedly to the advantage of governments to reconcile "in-groups and out-groups" (Festinger, 1958, p. 32). Discrepancies to prevent any sort of destabilizing conflicts that cause social and political unrest. Political parties are most likely to resort to group conflicts as a means to increase their popularity; therefore, governments ought to take legislative and constitutional measures to contain the rise of conflicts amongst groups (which spring from Hate Speech). More, the law should castigate those who endanger the unity of society by deploying and employing Hate Speech and group conflicts. According to some political activists, what aggravated the conflict in Libya is the division among Libyan people, and stratifications in society based on a sense of belonging to a certain family rather than another. The instantiation of Hate Speech amongst tribes preceded the civil war, and the escalation to physical attacks lay in the consciousness of the tribe members as "hidden transcripts" against the Gaddafi Family and other supporting families for many years. No form of resistance could be carried out due to the prejudice, bias and control exercised against other families.

Gordon Allport posits the question of whether legislation can decrease prejudice, therefore, Hate Speech. He quoted William Graham Sumner which assumes that "State ways cannot change folkways". The issue lies in the interpretive nature of language on the one hand, and in "radical instincts" for prejudice on the other (Allport, 1979, p. 505). Nevertheless, judicial and legislative endeavours ought to be taken to provide the infrastructure for remedial measures and to limit the rate of Hate Speech occurrence. Groups would know that producing "words that wound" cannot go unpunished (Delgado, 1993).

There have to be some measures at the level of the economy as well. Providing equality of opportunity for jobs and administrations may resolve issues of identity and group conflicts. Workplaces, where people of different backgrounds interact, reduce the tensions and evaporate the stereotypes carried out in their belief systems against other groups. Atmospheres as such create situations where tense identification with minorities dissolves and establishes a culture of tolerance and acceptance of the other.

It does not follow from that that minorities ought to abandon their identities and abandon the historicity of their culture and belief system. Such a presupposition correlates positively with the outbursts, riots, and protests against governments; it encourages groups to defend their culture and fuels Hate Speech. It is not a Melting Pot where ideas are fused and evaporated for the sake of social unity. Instead, it is more of a Mosaic piece of art, where the particularities of each group are preserved and adds value to the sociological structure, which contains diversity, plurality, and privacy. What is argued is that groups connect to their values and moral framework to accept others and help create an atmosphere of varying identities to live together. Unless such ideas are thoroughly embraced by each member of the group, it is most unlikely that co-existence will ever manifest. Institutions and civil society had better operate and connect to shared goals and values that encompass all people and regard them as equally important. The Egyptian philosopher Abdelwahab El-Massiri refers to the shared goal as “الهدف الحضاري”, or “the existential objective” (my translation), which means an aim that all members of a given society that belong to a geographical area share an aim to realize, from potential into actuality.

Festinger (1919-1989) argued that the psychological state of individuals determines the behaviour of the group as a whole, particularly in that individuals entertain specific thoughts rather than others; therefore, ideas of tolerance and peaceful coexistence ought to be entertained more often. (Festinger, 1950).

Equality of opportunity and outcomes invites groups to identify themselves with the larger sociological structure, especially since there has to be justice and high moral standards for equality to be manifested in societies. By so doing, groups will have a sense of belonging to values that transcend tight identification with groups or personal interests. Arriving at such a status renders itself easier said than done. Efforts ought to spring from solid knowledge and action plans in which civil communities and minorities aim to reach the same desideratum. There exists respectable literature on groups and minorities in various fields, particularly social psychology (Festinger, Allport, Le Bon, Milgram, etc).

Some researchers argue that political eclecticism represents theoretical frameworks where groups can be assimilated within society. *Assimilation* refers to a state where cultural and religious particularities do not interfere with any behavioural conduct at the level of institutions and public places. In addition, *Ethnic-Hyphenation* serves as a means to arrive at social unity, where identification with groups ought to always be hyphenated with the values of society. Values such as assimilation and ethnic hyphenation pave the way for multiculturalism. *Multi-culturalism* reduces the tension of group conflicts, way by engaging groups in the day-to-day activities of people and pulling groups out of isolation.

V –Conclusion

Researchers believe that a large sociological structure encompasses smaller components that make the whole social structure. Ethnic minorities denote the separation of the social

components, as it carries meanings of imagined boundaries with other groups that, paradoxically, serve the same end, the well-being of a given city or country. Social components, be they religious, ethnic, or of any sort, interact inevitably in public areas, workplaces and security facilities. Separation from and hostility towards social components manifest themselves in the real world only after imaginative ideas are nurtured; ideas that conceptualize and demonize the other. Such ideas correlate paradoxically to everyday reality, as interaction among group members cannot be overlooked or denied. Therefore, governments should propagate values of homogeneity and solidarity through educational systems, TV programmes and movies. Gustave Lu Bon (1859) argues that people have the mindset and the tendency to usually yield, follow and succumb rather than think and rationalize; therefore, such prejudice can be utilized to implement values of unity and equilibrium so that people yield to values that serve societies.

Further, in so many of his online lectures, Peterson (1962) makes the case that groups and individuals ought to realize that adversities and calamities form the structure of life and the fabric of reality; as a consequence, they, individuals and groups, ought to accept or even acquiesce speech that harms their emotions. We as species cannot reach a situation where speech expressing hate does not occur. In this regard, Peterson agrees with Gordon Allport on the naturality of hatred and prejudice. The conflict between Hate Speech and the Freedom of Speech is constitutional and still heats debates and public conversations. Peterson posited such an approach to behavioural conduct to resolve, as he stated, the identity politics dilemma. Sensitivity towards the other transforms any discourse into speech that aims to harm groups.

Though under severe attack and criticism, Critical Race Theory was introduced in the k-12 educational system of the U.S. as an implementable and measurable solution to racism and Hate Speech. Critical Race Theory says that racism is part; of everyday life, so people—white or non-white—who don't intend to be racist can nevertheless make choices that fuel racism.” (Sawchuk, 2018. p 22). Critical Race Theory argues that racism is a social construct that has a history that redeems it seemingly justifiable for one group to oppress the other. History has proven that white exercised oppression and lived a pleasant life at the expense of that of black people. Recognizing such a reality can help eschew any future calamities such as the ones passed throughout history. That is, history cannot be built upon to shape an attitude towards a particular oppressing group or conduct behavioural patterns with them. Instead, there should exist values that transcend the aggressive history; toleration and common interests and goals for the whole society.

- **References:**

- Allen, A. (1999). Solidarity after identity politics: Hannah Arendt and the power of feminist theory. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 25(1), 97–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019145379902500105>
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Altman, A. (2014). The Harm in Hate Speech By JEREMY WALDRON. *Analysis*, 75(1), 177–179. <https://doi.org/10.1093/analysis/anu098>
- Festinger, L. (1967). *Conflict, decision, and dissonance*. Stanford University Press.

- Hatt, M. (2000). The Subject of Hate Speech. *Oxford Art Journal*, 23(1), 139–146. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxartj/23.1.139>
- Josey, C. S. (2010). Hate speech and identity: An analysis of neo-racism and the indexing of identity. *Discourse & Society*, 21(1), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926509345071>
- Judge, M., & Nel, J. A. (2017). Psychology and hate speech: a critical and restorative encounter. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 48(1), 15–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246317728165>
- Scott, J. (1992). *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. Yale University Press.
- Sen, A. (2007). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (Issues of Our Time). W. W. Norton & Company.