

HATE SPEECH AND INCITEMENT TO DISCRIMINATION

in the public space and media
in the Republic of Moldova

MONITORING PERIOD: 11.01.2019 – 11.04.2019

REPORT 2019 / SUMMARY



Promo - LEX

Promovarea democrației și a drepturilor omului

Author: Dumitru Sliusarenco
Contributed by: Alexandru Postica, Irina Corobcenco
Coordinator of the edition: Olga Manole
Translation in English language: Intart Design SRL
Computerized processing and editing: Mihail Catan

All rights reserved. The content of the Report may be used and reproduced for non-profit purposes without the prior consent of the Promo-LEX Association, provided the source of information is indicated.

DISTRIBUTED FREE OF CHARGE

The report has been carried out as part of the project "Strengthening the platform for development of activism and education of Human Rights in the Republic of Moldova – II stage", implemented by the Promo-LEX Association, with the financial support of the Department of Justice and Human Rights of the Soros Foundation-Moldova.

The content of the Report reflects the opinion and position of the authors. The Soros Foundation-Moldova is not responsible for the content of the present Report.

This document is a brief summary of the report. The full report is available in Romanian language.



CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. METHODOLOGY	5
III. RECOMMENDATIONS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	7

INTRODUCTION

Hate speech, incitement to discrimination and violence, sexism and other forms of expressing intolerance are being used increasingly in the public space and media of the Republic of Moldova. In the context of a divided society, geopolitical struggle, ethno-linguistic and religious tension, the aforementioned became efficient tools for the manipulation and generation of false problems and threats.

In 2018, Promo-LEX Association published the first report on a complex analysis of hate speech in the Republic of Moldova (hereinafter referred to as the *2018 Report*). According to the 2018 Report, there were 368 cases of hate speech and other forms of public promotion of intolerance during 181 days of monitoring, i.e. two cases per day on the average. The public resonance of these cases was alarming – they gathered over 3 million views and over 60 thousand shares¹.

As shown in the 2018 Report, hate speech was mostly used in political (42%) and religious (40%) context, while politicians were the public actors that used and gained most out of this type of speech. They included: President of the Republic of Moldova, Igor Dodon; chair of SOR Political Party (PP SOR), Ilan Sor, and the deputy chair of the party, Marina Tauber; chair of the Communist Party of the Republic of Moldova (PCRM), Vladimir Voronin; chair of Our Party (Partidul Nostru – PN), Renato Usatii a.o. At the same time, religious activist Ghenadie Valuta, pastor Vasile Filat and His Eminence Metropolitan Vladimir were involved in most cases of hate speech in a religious context.

The alarming situation was also confirmed in 2018 by the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), which noted in its report on the Republic of Moldova that politics plays an important role in the emergence, exacerbation and spread of hate speech. ECRI also noted that prejudice against some social groups (*LGBT, women, Roma, Muslims*) leads to hate speech. ECRI emphasised that the lack of response by authorities, uncontrolled online environment, inefficient punishment mechanisms and deficient legislation play a significant role in spreading hate and intolerance in the society².

Thus, given the topicality of the problem in question and the social threat that it poses, further monitoring and analysis of hate speech needs to be an important condition for ensuring the necessary statistical and factual basis for preventing and combating this phenomenon in the public space and media of the Republic of Moldova.

1. [Promo-LEX Association, 2018, Hate speech and incitement to discrimination in the public space and media in the Republic of Moldova](#); point 5.1.
2. [European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, 2018, ECRI Report on the Republic of Moldova \(Fifth Monitoring Cycle\)](#) point. 47.



METHODOLOGY

The Report analyses quantitative data obtained as a result of a complex monitoring activity carried out by Promo-LEX Association under the “Strengthening a Platform for the Development of Human Rights Activism and Education in Moldova – II stage” Project, funded by the Justice and Human Rights Department of Soros Foundation Moldova.

The methodology is similar to the one used to develop the 2018 Report, with the appropriate amendments and adjustments. Unlike the original methodology, this one did not envisage a review of the relevant national and international standards and of the case-law, as these were reviewed in the 2018 Report and it would have been irrelevant to do the review again.

Research goal: Analyse and assess the extent to which hate speech and incitement to discrimination is used in the public space in the Republic of Moldova, as well as the authorities’ response to and sanctioning of such a discourse.

To analyse the work of the authorities and law enforcement bodies, inquiries for information were sent to the Superior Council of Magistracy, General Prosecutor’s Office and Ministry of Internal Affairs, CPEDEE, CEC and BCC.

The dynamics and intensity of hate speech were analysed based on the information gathered by monitoring the public space and media in the Republic of Moldova.

Monitoring period: 11.01.2019 – 11.04.2019. For 2019, it was decided to divide the monitoring period into two separate cycles of three months to make sure that the most important political events of the year, general parliamentary and local elections, are covered.

Five experts contracted for this activity performed the monitoring. The identified cases were reported based on the monitoring questionnaires developed for this report. The questionnaires included a series of categories used to measure and analyse the general data, such as date when the reported cases were published, category of sources, context in which the (political or religious) case occurs, if it was generated by representatives of local or central public authorities, etc.

The questionnaire also included fields used to analyse directly how discrimination and intolerance are manifested, such as grounds of discrimination, sex and age of hate speech authors, sex and age of the targeted persons, affected groups, comments that incite hatred, etc. The questionnaire also included fields for the quantitative analysis of some data, such as total number of distributions and views of the reported cases and number of cases covered by other media sources.

Object of monitoring: Online media sources, TV, social networks, cyber platforms for storing and disseminating information, public events, public statements by public figures, politicians and religious figures.

Strategy for selecting media sources: Media sources were selected on the basis of audience indicators and internet traffic surveys, as well as surveys made by sociological companies. Political and religious personalities were selected based on sociological surveys and surveys on public confidence, but also depending on their media presence (see footnote 3)³.

Theoretical and practical approach: Data were analysed and interpreted following the broad approach to the concept of hate speech, which includes legal definitions in the national and international law, as well as related concepts, such as incitement to discrimination, sexist, homophobic, racist discourse, incitement to violence, threats, support for ideologies based on the superiority of a group, defamation and public insult based on the depreciation or denigration of a group, and public promotion of intolerance.

ONLINE SOCIAL MEDIA	TV	RELIGIOUS MEDIA	ONLINE
1. www.actualitati.md	1. Moldova 1	1. www.ortodox.md	1. www.moldovandream.com
2. www.agora.md	2. Prime	2. www.mitropolia.md	2. Times New Moldovan (fb)
3. www.aif.md	3. Publika	3. www.moldovacrestina.md	3. Dodon nu este preşedintele meu (fb)
4. www.bloknnot-moldova.md	4. Canal 2	4. http://altarulcredintei.md/	4. Nu plaha (fb)
5. www.deschide.md	5. Canal 3	5. www.episcopia-ungheni.md	5. Stiripespuse (fb)
6. www.flux.md	6. Jurnal TV	6. www.ephbalti.md	
7. www.jurnal.md	7. NTV	7. www.aparatorul.md	
8. www.kp.md	8. Accent TV	8. jw.org	
9. www.noi.md	9. RTR Moldova		
10. www.point.md	10. TV8		
11. www.protv.md	11. 10TV		
12. www.realitatea.md	12. TV21		
13. www.sputnik.md	13. Btv.md		
14. www.timpul.md	14. ProTV		
15. www.tv8.md	15. TVC		
16. www.tvrmoldova.md	16. Orhei TV		
17. www.unimedia.info			
18. www.telegraph.md			
19. www.publika.md			
20. www.orheitev.md			
21. www.tvc.md			

NOTE: To ensure consistent terminology, the report operates with the generic notion of hate speech, which includes the following related and derived forms and concepts: incitement to violence, threats, incitement to discrimination, racist, anti-Semitic, homophobic and sexist speech, and prejudice-motivated crime.

3. The list of sources was adjusted along the way on the basis of the monitoring findings. During the monitoring period, some Facebook pages, such as: Times New Moldovan, Dodon is not my president, Stiripespuse were deleted by the Facebook administration.



RECOMMENDATIONS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

SANCTIONING HATE SPEECH

- The hate speech remains largely unsanctioned, despite the plenty of cases identified in the public space and in the media. The authorities, except CPEDEE, do not respond to such cases.
- Currently, authorities do not respond to hate speech in the political and election context. There is neither pertinent legal framework nor mechanisms to combat this phenomenon. The general mechanisms, such as courts or CPEDEE, may review the rhetoric of hate from the civil point of view, but can not provide a solution that would solve the issue from an election point of view. In this respect, hate speech is completely uncontrolled, regardless of its impact on the election process.

GENERAL TRENDS

- The general trends as regards the hate speech are worrying, with 319 cases reported in three months compared to 368 cases identified in six months in 2018. The increase is about 83%, with an average of 3.5 new cases per day.
- The total number of views of the identified cases amounts to 4,000,556 or, on average, more than 43,962 views per day, which represents an average of over 100% increase in public resonance.
- Men use hate speech almost four times more often than women, with a ratio of 79% (men) to 21% (women).
- The age group of 35–50 years, followed by young people up to 35 years and people older than 50 years, is the most affected by the hate speech.
- The hate speech in a religious context is less used than in 2018 (19% in 2019 vs 40% in 2018), while hate speech in a political context is rising (67% in 2019 vs 42% in 2018).
- In the vast majority of cases, the hate speech and incitement to discrimination build on the same criteria that were identified in the 2018 Report: sex/gender, sexual orientation and political affiliation. These data reflect the general situation in the society, which is strongly disaggregated on gender, political, geopolitical, linguistic and religious grounds. However, during the current monitoring period, we noted key differences related to the distribution of grounds, so that most cases were identified on the basis of sex/gender (170), followed by political affiliation (68) and LGBT (52).
- The increase in the number of speeches based on prejudices and gender stereotypes led to an increase in intolerance and discrimination against women, i.e. the most affected group, compared to 2018, when the LGBT was the most often targeted group in such rhetoric. Although the current monitoring period lasted three months, i.e. twice as short as in 2018, it is alarming that the number of cases

of hate speech affecting women almost tripled and for a large part of the other groups (politicians and political supporters, men, people with disabilities, journalists, Romanians, Russians, Roma, etc.) the number remained roughly the same, with small increases or decreases. These trends are worrying and demonstrate that hate speech, manifested in the most diverse forms, is amplifying, and becoming a tool increasingly used by both, politicians and the media.

AFFECTED GROUPS

- A total of 162 cases promoting intolerance towards women in various forms were identified. In the overwhelming majority of cases, the intolerance towards women is manifested via sexist expressions or images, the uses of stereotypes and gender prejudices and clichés related to the social roles of women in society. Although the majority of these are not aggressive and do not usually incite to violence, they promote prejudices that can lead to discrimination of women in the most diverse social spheres. In this way, the gender inequality and the image of the woman as a sexual object are perpetuated, and its role in society is diminished. As a result, gender violence and sexual violence can be provoked. The exaggerated number of sexism cases denotes a serious problem in the Republic of Moldova in terms of response, prevention and combating of gender-based discrimination, as well as a pronounced lack of journalistic ethics of some media portals.
- Even if hatred and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity fell by about 30% compared to 2018, the LGBT group remains among the most affected groups against which some of the most aggressive and violent speeches were made. This rhetoric is largely caused by prejudices, catalysed by conservative religious, and sometimes even radical speeches about family and traditional values, sin and immorality. This rhetoric is largely promoted in two dimensions. On the political dimension, hate speech is used as a tool of manipulation, denigration and ridiculing of opponents, generation of false problems and threats, and empowering of some social groups on the account of others. On the religious conservatism dimension, aggressive messages and information about homosexuals and transsexuals are promoted intensely, largely associating them with amorality, pedophilia, abnormality and sin.
- Prejudices against persons with disabilities are most often used in the political discourse to denigrate opponents by using discriminatory language and terminology, associations with a disease, disability and mental health. Some journalists use comparisons with people with mental disabilities to cast a negative light on people they criticize.
- Incitement to discrimination against Romanians and Romanian speakers was manifested both on the political background, by ridiculing or denigrating the pro-Romanian politicians, and by presenting biased information, especially in headlines, that associates the Romanian nationality or language with negative events or facts. Similar expressions were also identified with regards to Russians and Russian speakers.
- Twelve cases of hate speeches against unionists were identified during three months of monitoring, compared to 32 cases identified in 2019 (during six months of monitoring).

HATE SPEECH AND POLITICS

- In the context of the political parties that generated a hate speech, 'SOR' Party delivered only one hate speech, registering the biggest difference compared to 2018, when 20 cases were made. PSRM remained among the parties that generated most of the intolerance cases in the public space, although recording a decrease by about 25%, while PD, PLDM and PAS did not generate any hate speech. On the other hand, the cases generated by PN and PCRPM increased worryingly by about 50%.
- Among politicians, Ilan Sor generated only one hate speech, compared to 12 made in 2018. Marina Tauber, who in 2018 generated seven such cases, made no hate speech in 2019. Igor Dodon, who was in the top of these statistics in 2018, with 19 cases, made five hate speeches in 2019. Renato Usatii and Vladimir Voronin are the only politicians who in 2019 generated more cases of hate speech than in 2018.
- Hate speeches promoted by politicians often target other politicians and generate their responses, which are also often based on intolerance. This is how a vicious circle is created, when hate gives rise to hate, each time indirectly affecting the society, especially the most vulnerable groups. In 2019, Maia Sandu, Andrei Nastase and Igor Dodon were the politicians most affected by hate speech, just like in 2018.
- According to the monitoring results, the political context leads to an increasing number of public expression of intolerance. Electoral processes are an additional factor of amplification of political rivalry, media presence, and interaction with voters. The 2018 Report found that hate speech increases intensively during electoral processes, and existing legal and institutional measures are not enough to control this phenomenon. The results of the 2019 monitoring confirm these findings, so that there is a direct link between the increase in the hate speech dynamics during pre-election periods and its decrease after the elections.
- Electoral processes play the role of social tensions' catalyst, particularly by increasing the number of political discourses based on intolerance, hate and discrimination. Of the total number of 319 cases identified during the monitoring period, 89 were expressed in the electoral context. The hate speeches made in the electoral context are tougher and more aggressive, using often denigrating and defamatory expressions and images published on false social network accounts, leading up to violence in some cases.

HATE SPEECH AND RELIGION

- In the religious context, the rhetoric of protecting traditional values and family prevails, as it was in 2018. A number of fictitious dangers are promoted, such as homosexuality, islamisation, invasion of immigrants and refugees and distorting women's role in the family and society due to gender equality and feminism. Namely, the rhetoric built on these pillars generates most of hate speeches and situations of intolerance.
- Religious rhetoric towards LGBT people is expressed through associations with sin, divine punishment, evil and subsequent disastrous effects that will arise. At the same time, some messages also include related phenomena such as 'gender identity' and sexual education, which are also associated with the issue of homosexuality, presenting them as the ultimate evil of the modern world.
- The religious rhetoric towards women is primarily based on their role in the family, which is limited to the care for children, husband and house. The subjects of abortion or feminism, seen as evil and sin that lead to the decline of the modern woman are also addressed.
- The discourse about Muslims is largely based on associating this group with either terrorists and extremists or islamisation, which could endanger Christianity.

- Rhetoric based on religious principles or doctrines is different from all other forms of discourse. It calls on the divine forces and supreme laws, which can not be disputed, thus excluding any debate. Audience can only accept or reject this rhetoric, which has a great success among many members of society, in the context of a society marked by religious conservatism and traditional values (like that of the Republic of Moldova). There is a need for mechanisms to sanction hate speech justified by various religious dogmas and involvement of religious cults' representatives in political activities.

HATE SPEECH AND MEDIA

- Media is the most important source of spreading intolerance in the public space. The 319 cases identified were spread by 627 various sources, of which 519 were online media. Most Moldovan media outlets covered and spread cases of hate speech and promoted intolerance in the public space during the monitoring period.
- 149 cases when the media and journalists generated hate speech or other forms of intolerance were identified. It usually takes place by expressing personal opinions in media articles, publishing discriminatory titles to attract audience, using sexist or denigrating images and promoting prejudices.
- Sputnik Moldova is the portal that generated the most intolerant materials during the monitoring period (89), more than all other media outlets altogether. Most of these materials are sexist expressions. Likewise, the cases identified on publika.md and kp.md pages are mostly cases of sexism, while the expressions on bloknat-moldova, deschide.md and flux.md pages are based on prejudices relating to LGBT people, nationality, language and religious beliefs.
- Most cases of incitement to hatred, discrimination or other forms of intolerance were broadcast on Prime Moldova TV station. The most cases of hate speech were identified during *'Vorbeste Moldova' (Moldova speaks)* show on Prime and *'Dezbateri electorale – Alege liber' (Election debates – Choose freely)* with Mariana Rata show on TV8.
- TV shows have an issue with moderating hate speech, presenters intervened to stop or condemn hate speech only in five of 27 cases, but most often, such speeches remain without reaction and presenters either provoked or supported discriminatory expressions in six cases.
- Analytical and talk shows often facilitate the emergence of hate speech due to their format, which implies much interaction and polemic between guests and, most of the time, hot discussions. Nonetheless, moderators' role is to be vigilant and to disrupt or prevent discriminatory expressions when they occur, but, during the monitoring period, most moderators either lacked the knowledge and training needed to intervene or were not interested to do it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A range of recommendations, systematised by type of identified issues and institutional competence for solving them, were developed in the 2018 Report. Since most of these recommendations have not been implemented and continue to be relevant, they will be repeated in this chapter.

LEGISLATIVE LEVEL

Adjust the criminal and contravention legislation on sanctioning of acts motivated by prejudice

- Adopt draft Law No 301 of Parliament of the Republic of Moldova amending and supplementing certain legal acts on regulating crimes motivated by prejudice, according to the international standards.

Sanction hate speech during election campaigns

- Review the electoral legal framework, especially the Electoral Code, in order to define hate speech in election campaigns and regulate ways of discouraging the use of this speech.
- Establish a mechanism for monitoring, documenting and sanctioning the hate speech during the election campaigns.

INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

The Government should

- Develop, jointly with the civil society, a comprehensive strategy for preventing and combating hate speech. The strategy should include the establishment of a hate speech monitoring mechanism, cooperation between law enforcement authorities and other relevant bodies (e.g. CPEDEE), in order to facilitate the criminal prosecution of hate speech and improvement of hate speech sanctioning mechanisms.
- Develop and implement regular awareness raising campaigns on preventing and combating hate speech, in collaboration with law enforcement bodies, CPEDEE, Ombudsperson, Broadcasting Coordination Council, Press Council, Central Electoral Commission and the civil society.

Broadcasting Coordination Council should

- Effectively implement the provisions on hate and sexist speech, included in the Broadcasting Code, as well as measures of ensuring equality in audiovisual products.
- React firmly to all cases of hate speech and set appropriate sanctions for each violation.
- Establish an internal mechanism for monitoring hate speech and collect disaggregated data on cases of hate speech in audiovisual products.
- Develop a disaggregated data collection system to provide a coherent and integrated vision of cases, form of speech and its reasons, as well as the solution applied, and make this information routinely available to the public.
- Develop internal tools to streamline the monitoring and sanctioning of hate speech (instructions, guidelines).
- Carry out periodic training activities for members and employees on identifying hate speech, sexism, racism, homophobia, forms of their expression, protected grounds and society's prejudices.

The Central Electoral Commission should

- Begin to establish a mechanism for monitoring, documenting and sanctioning the hate speech during the election campaigns.
- React promptly and firmly to all reported cases of hate speech and set appropriate sanctions for each violation.
- Develop a disaggregated data collection system to provide a coherent and integrated vision of cases, form of speech and its reasons, as well as the solution applied, and make this information routinely available to the public.
- Develop internal tools to streamline the monitoring, documenting and sanctioning hate speech (instructions, guidelines).
- Publicly condemn hate speech and carry out activities to promote tolerant public speech in election processes and to deter election candidates from using intolerant rhetoric.
- Carry out periodic training for election bodies' members and employees on identifying hate speech, sexism, racism, homophobia, forms of their expression, protected grounds and society's prejudices.

The Council for Preventing and Eliminating Discrimination and Ensuring Equality should

- Initiate awareness raising campaigns on deterring hate speech and promoting equality in the media and public space.
- Continue to monitor hate speech in the media and public space, especially in political context, and take action each time when such cases are found.
- Develop a disaggregated data collection system to provide a coherent and integrated vision of cases, form of speech and its reasons, as well as the solution applied, and make this information routinely available to the public.
- Strengthen efforts of assisting other public authorities (police, Prosecutor's office, BCC, CEC) in monitoring, identifying and sanctioning hate speech.

The National Institute of Justice and Superior Council of Magistracy should

- Carry out periodic training for judges and judicial assistants on hate speech, sexism, racism, homophobia, forms of their expression, protected grounds and ways of sanctioning, based on the international standards and best practices.

The police and Prosecutor's Office should

- Develop internal tools to streamline the identification and sanctioning of hate speech and prejudice-motivated crimes (regulations, instructions, guidelines).
- Carry out periodic training for police officers, prosecuting officers and prosecutors on hate speech, sexism, racism, homophobia, forms of their expression, protected grounds and ways of sanctioning, based on the international standards and best practices.
- Develop a disaggregated data collection system to provide a coherent and integrated vision of cases, form of speech and its reasons, as well as the solution applied, and make this information routinely available to the public.

Political parties and politicians should

- Condemn hate speech and adopt codes of conduct that prohibit the use of hate speech. Urge party members and supporters to refrain from using hate speech and impose disciplinary sanctions if deviations are found.
- Use the national mechanisms for reviewing and sanctioning the hate speech every time this speech targets or affects them.
- Carry out periodic training for party members on hate speech, sexism, racism, homophobia, forms of their expression, society's prejudices and ways of ensuring a tolerant speech.

The media should

- The Press Council and media organisations should develop and adopt tools (guidelines or recommendations) to ensure that journalistic materials cover situations involving hate speech in an impartial way and do not exacerbate them.
- News portals and media outlets should include in their policies and internal programs rules that condemn and remove the hate speech from their media activity.
- News portals should adopt clear and effective mechanisms of comments' management in order to avoid the promotion of hate speech.
- Media organisations and outlets should periodically train journalists to make them understand the hate speech phenomenon and develop the capacities of managing journalistic materials in order to decrease the impact of cases that involve this type of speech.

Civil society organisations should

- Periodically monitor hate speech and dynamics of this speech in the public space and online environment and help improve the relevant legal framework.
- Initiate and carry out, including together with authorities, information and awareness raising campaigns regarding the phenomenon of hate and discriminatory speech, as well as its impact on the society.
- Carry out periodic training for young people, students, journalists, activists (including political activists), politicians and religious cults' representatives on hate speech, sexism, racism, homophobia, forms of their expression, protected grounds and danger they generate.

de aproape patru ori mai frecvent decât femeile. Intoleranța bazată pe sex/gen, orientare sexuală și apartenență politică este utilizată cel mai des în discursurile de ură. Numărul cazurilor care afectează femeile aproape s-a triplat, comparativ cu raportul precedent. Discriminarea și intoleranța față de femei se manifestă cel mai des prin exprimări sexiste. LGBT rămâne în topul celor mai afectate grupuri de discurs de ură împotriva cărora au fost înregistrate unele din cele mai agresive și mai violente discursuri. Pe dimensiunea conservatorismului religios sunt promovate intensiv mesaje și informații agresive față de persoanele homosexuale și transsexuale în mare parte, asociindu-le cu amoralitatea, pedofilia, anormalitatea și păcatul. Pe dimensiunea politică, discursul de ură este utilizat ca instrument de manipulare, denigrare a oponentilor, ridiculizare, creare de probleme și pericole false și consolidare a unor grupuri sociale împotriva altora. Persoanele cu dizabilități sunt asociate cu boala, neputința și incapacitatea, iar persoanele cu dizabilități mintale sunt cel mai des asociate cu crimele și violența. Instigarea la discriminare împotriva românilor și rusilor s-a manifestat în special pe fundal politic prin ridiculizare sau denigrare. Presa a utilizat asocierea acestor grupuri cu evenimente sau fapte negative, infracționale sau amurale. Discursul de ură promovat de politicieni îi afectează în mare parte pe alți politicieni, care la rândul lor răspund la fel cu discurs de ură, creând un cerc vicios, când ura produce ură. În 2019 cei mai afectați politicieni de discursul de ură au fost Maia Sandu, Andrei Năstase și Igor Dodon, exact ca în 2018. Contextul politic predispune spre creșterea numărului de cazuri de manifestare publică a intoleranței. Procesele electorale reprezintă un factor suplimentar de amplificare a tensiunilor sociale, iar discursul de ură devine mai agresiv în comparație cu alte perioade. Măsurile legislative și instituționale existente nu sunt suficiente pentru a controla acest discurs de ură în campaniile electorale. În context religios predomină retorica protecției valorilor tradiționale și a familiei, sunt promovate un pericole fictive, ca homosexualitatea, islamizarea, invazia imigranților și refugiaților, dar și denaturarea rolului femeii în familie și în societate. Retorica religioasă față de persoanele LGBT se manifestă prin asocieri cu păcatul, pedeapsa divină, răul și eventualele efecte dezastruoase care urmează să survină. Retorica religioasă față de femei se bazează pe rolurile acestora în familie și societate, este condamnat dreptul femeilor la avort, dar și mișcările feministe. Discursul față de musulmani se bazează în mare parte pe asocierea acestui grup fie cu teroristii și extremistii, fie cu islamizarea, care ar putea pune în pericol creștinismul. Mass-media reprezintă cea mai importantă sursă de distribuție a intoleranței în spațiul public. Majoritatea institutiilor media din Moldova au relatat și au distribuit cazurile de discurs de ură și promovare a intoleranței care au apărut în spațiul public. Mass-media promovează intoleranța prin plasarea titlurilor discriminatorii, asocierea unor grupuri sociale cu evenimente sau fapte negative, criminale sau amurale, prin utilizarea imaginilor sexiste și prin promovarea prejudecăților. Emisiunile analitice și talk-show-urile TV facilitează apariția discursului de ură, mai ales când moderatorii nu intervin în discursurile discriminatorii, dar mai ales când le susțin sau provoacă. Discursul de ură rămâne nesancționat în pofida unui număr mare de cazuri identificate în spațiul public și în mass-media. Bărbații utilizează discursul de ură de aproape patru ori mai frecvent decât femeile. Intoleranța bazată pe sex/gen, orientare sexuală și apartenență politică este utilizată cel mai des în discursurile de ură. Numărul cazurilor care afectează femeile aproape s-a triplat, comparativ cu raportul precedent. Discriminarea și intoleranța față de femei se manifestă cel mai des prin exprimări sexiste. LGBT rămâne în topul celor mai afectate grupuri de discurs de ură împotriva cărora au fost înregistrate unele din cele mai agresive și mai violente discursuri. Pe dimensiunea conservatorismului religios sunt promovate intensiv mesaje și informații agresive față de persoanele homosexuale și transsexuale în mare parte, asociindu-le cu amoralitatea, pedofilia, anormalitatea și păcatul. Pe dimensiunea politică, discursul de ură este utilizat ca instrument de manipulare, denigrare a oponentilor, ridiculizare, creare de probleme și pericole false și consolidare a unor grupuri sociale împotriva altora. Persoanele cu dizabilități sunt asociate cu boala, neputința și incapacitatea, iar persoanele cu dizabilități mintale sunt cel mai des asociate cu crimele și violența. Instigarea la discriminare împotriva românilor și rusilor s-a manifestat în special pe fundal politic prin ridiculizare sau denigrare. Presa a utilizat asocierea acestor grupuri cu evenimente sau fapte negative, infracționale sau amurale. Discursul de ură promovat de politicieni îi afectează în mare parte pe alți politicieni, care la rândul lor răspund la fel cu discurs de ură, creând un cerc vicios, când ura produce ură. În 2019 cei mai afectați politicieni de discursul de ură au fost Maia Sandu, Andrei Năstase și Igor Dodon, exact ca în 2018. Contextul politic predispune spre creșterea numărului de cazuri de manifestare publică a intoleranței. Procesele electorale reprezintă un factor suplimentar de amplificare a tensiunilor sociale, iar discursul de ură devine mai agresiv în comparație cu alte perioade. Măsurile legislative și instituționale existente nu sunt suficiente pentru a controla acest discurs de ură în campaniile electorale. În context religios predomină retorica protecției valorilor tradiționale și a familiei, sunt promovate un pericole fictive, ca homosexualitatea, islamizarea, invazia imigranților și refugiaților, dar și denaturarea rolului femeii în familie și în societate. Retorica religioasă față de persoanele LGBT se manifestă prin asocieri cu păcatul, pedeapsa divină, răul și eventualele efecte dezastruoase care urmează să survină. Retorica religioasă față de femei se bazează pe rolurile acestora în familie și societate, este condamnat dreptul femeilor la avort, dar și mișcările feministe. Discursul față de musulmani se bazează în mare parte pe asocierea acestui grup fie cu teroristii și extremistii, fie cu islamizarea, care ar putea pune în pericol creștinismul. Mass-media reprezintă cea mai importantă sursă de distribuție a intoleranței în spațiul public. Majoritatea institutiilor media din Moldova au relatat și au distribuit

discursurile discriminatorii, asocierea unor grupuri sociale cu evenimente sau fapte negative, criminale sau amurale, prin utilizarea imaginilor sexiste și prin promovarea prejudecăților. Emisiunile analitice și talk-show-urile TV facilitează apariția discursului de ură, mai ales când moderatorii nu intervin în discursurile discriminatorii, dar mai ales când le susțin sau provoacă. Discursul de ură rămâne nesancționat în pofida unui număr mare de cazuri identificate în spațiul public și în mass-media. Bărbații utilizează discursul de ură de aproape patru ori mai frecvent decât femeile. Intoleranța bazată pe sex/gen, orientare sexuală și apartenență politică este utilizată cel mai des în discursurile de ură. Numărul cazurilor care afectează femeile aproape s-a triplat, comparativ cu raportul precedent. Discriminarea și intoleranța față de femei se manifestă cel mai des prin exprimări sexiste. LGBT rămâne în topul celor mai afectate grupuri de discurs de ură împotriva cărora au fost înregistrate unele din cele mai agresive și mai violente discursuri. Pe dimensiunea conservatorismului religios sunt promovate intensiv mesaje și informații agresive față de persoanele homosexuale și transsexuale în mare parte, asociindu-le cu amoralitatea, pedofilia, anormalitatea și păcatul. Pe dimensiunea politică, discursul de ură este utilizat ca instrument de manipulare, denigrare a oponentilor, ridiculizare, creare de probleme și pericole false și consolidare a unor grupuri sociale împotriva altora. Persoanele cu dizabilități sunt asociate cu boala, neputința și incapacitatea, iar persoanele cu dizabilități mintale sunt cel mai des asociate cu crimele și violența. Instigarea la discriminare împotriva românilor și rusilor s-a manifestat în special pe fundal politic prin ridiculizare sau denigrare. Presa a utilizat asocierea acestor grupuri cu evenimente sau fapte negative, infracționale sau amurale. Discursul de ură promovat de politicieni îi afectează în mare parte pe alți politicieni, care la rândul lor răspund la fel cu discurs de ură, creând un cerc vicios, când ura produce ură. În 2019 cei mai afectați politicieni de discursul de ură au fost Maia Sandu, Andrei Năstase și Igor Dodon, exact ca în 2018. Contextul politic predispune spre creșterea numărului de cazuri de manifestare publică a intoleranței. Procesele electorale reprezintă un factor suplimentar de amplificare a tensiunilor sociale, iar discursul de ură devine mai agresiv în comparație cu alte perioade. Măsurile legislative și instituționale existente nu sunt suficiente pentru a controla acest discurs de ură în campaniile electorale. În context religios predomină retorica protecției valorilor tradiționale și a familiei, sunt promovate un pericole fictive, ca homosexualitatea, islamizarea, invazia imigranților și refugiaților, dar și denaturarea rolului femeii în familie și în societate. Retorica religioasă față de persoanele LGBT se manifestă prin asocieri cu păcatul, pedeapsa divină, răul și eventualele efecte dezastruoase care urmează să survină. Retorica religioasă față de femei se bazează pe rolurile acestora în familie și societate, este condamnat dreptul femeilor la avort, dar și mișcările feministe. Discursul față de musulmani se bazează în mare parte pe asocierea acestui grup fie cu teroristii și extremistii, fie cu islamizarea, care ar putea pune în pericol creștinismul. Mass-media reprezintă cea mai importantă sursă de distribuție a intoleranței în spațiul public. Majoritatea institutiilor media din Moldova au relatat și au distribuit cazurile de discurs de ură și promovare a intoleranței care au apărut în spațiul public. Mass-media promovează intoleranța prin plasarea titlurilor discriminatorii, asocierea unor grupuri sociale cu evenimente sau fapte negative, criminale sau amurale, prin utilizarea imaginilor sexiste și prin promovarea prejudecăților. Emisiunile analitice și talk-show-urile TV facilitează apariția discursului de ură, mai