

Digital public space, disputes and violence: comments on two Argentine LGBTIQ blogs

Espacio público digital, disputas y violencias: comentarios en dos blogs argentinos LGBTIQ

Magalí Daniela Pérez-Riedel

Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, Bernal, Argentina
mdpr88@gmail.com

Abstract

*In this article, we outline an analytical reflection on the territorial disputes that take place between 2012 and 2015 in the comments sections of the Argentine blogs *Tod@s* and *Boquitas pintadas*, where sex-gender diversity issues are addressed. We conducted a theoretical-conceptual approach from Latin American cultural studies and Internet studies from a feminist and queer perspective. Our work focuses on a corpus of 5,095 comments that we analyze with a qualitative methodological strategy. We inquire about the meanings of spatial appropriations and disputes about users' sense of belonging with respect to these blogs.*

Keywords

Discourse, CDA, sexual diversity, LGBTIQ, Internet.

Resumen

En el presente artículo analiza las disputas territoriales que acontecen entre 2012 y 2015 en las secciones de los comentarios de los blogs argentinos *Tod@s* y *Boquitas pintadas*, donde se abordan temáticas de diversidad sexo-genérica. Realizamos una aproximación teórico-conceptual desde los estudios culturales latinoamericanos y los estudios de Internet con una perspectiva feminista y *queer*. Nos extendemos sobre un corpus de 5.095 comentarios que analizamos con una estrategia metodológica principalmente cualitativa para indagar sobre los sentidos sobre las apropiaciones espaciales y las disputas por los sentidos de pertenencia de los usuarios respecto a estos blogs.

Palabras clave

Discurso, ACD, diversidad sexual, LGBTIQ, Internet.

1. Introduction

In Argentina, the passing of Law No. 26,618 in favor same-sex marriage in 2010 brought on the debate for recognition of lesbians, gays, bisexuals, trans, intersex and queers (LGBTIQ) in the public agenda. In this context, two blogs started in order to discuss issues linked to this collective, *Boquitas pintadas* (BP) and *Tod@s*, at the hand of the two most powerful multimedia outlets with greatest influence in the country, *La Nación* and *Grupo Clarín*. In charge of each blog are journalists Verónica Dema and Bruno Bimbi, who work posting entries on each blog and monitoring user comments.

We start with the premise that interest in gender topics and sexual dissidence draws participation in these blogs: as you can see in an investigation of self-authorship (Pérez Riedel, 2014), these comments can be violent towards LGBTIQ people and can contribute to promotion of discrimination. However, some questions are what are the meanings that users build in regards to the blogs in which they participate, what do their disputes for ownership of these places consist of. How do they talk about their sense of belonging? To answer these questions, we conduct our study from the field of Latin American cultural studies with a feminist and queer perspective that dialogues with Internet studies. For this purpose, we use the theoretical-methodological tools that the Critical Discourse Analysis offers and we complement with other mainly qualitative techniques and methods. We created a corpus made up of 5,095 comments posted in the blogs between 2012 and 2015, period that corresponded to years during the second term of President Cristina Fernández, in which laws and other measures were promoted after the recognition of LGBTIQ people's rights¹.

We found that that violent comments against LGBTIQ people not only include discriminatory representations based on hate motivated by identity and gender expression and sexual orientation but also show different

ways of owning the comments section. At first, we observed that there are users that refer to blogs as "ghettos" and argue that LGBTIQ people discriminate against those who are not like them by denying them the right to participate and freely express themselves. In addition, they mark a "we" (and a "them") and create and legitimize a sense of belonging to a space that they identify as their own. They reject hostile participation of those who jeopardize their sense of unity or those who threaten property ownerships of the blogs. Simultaneously, those responsible for each blog observe the coexistence of violent interventions with others that seek to converse, but conclude that the blogs fall into the hands of attackers, who seal off and inhibit the participation of other LGBTIQ subjects.

2. Theoretical Framework

We understand communication as a social process of production, circulation and negotiation of meanings that take place in the heart of culture, and not as a lineal process of transmission of information. Communication creates social relationships in which active subjects participate, who create meanings, build identities and take over meanings intervening in the culture, that is defined as a total social process or a fighting ring where different people participate in relation to unequal power (Williams, 2000; Martín-Barbero, 2010).

However, the disputes for dominance become disputes for representation. Just as Louis Marin says, "if representation not only reproduces factually but also legally the conditions that make its reproduction possible, you can understand the interest of the power in owning it. Representation and power are from the same nature" (2009: 138). Discourses are implied in processes of knowledge/power: the power of the representation consists in assigning or classifying subjects and contri-

bute to sustaining inequalities or to resisting them. As Stuart Hall states, "representation is an essential part of the process via which meaning is produced and exchanged between members of a culture" (2010: 447).

In that sense, Latin American cultural studies:

comprise an intellectual and political project that: 1) conceives culture-as-power and the power-as-culture; 2) suppose a non-reductionist focus that is expressed in an trans-disciplinary attitude; 3) imply a political vocation that seeks to influence the world; and 4) their frame is the radical contextualism (in regards to its forma de theorization, to the methodologies used, to their conceptualization of politics and to their own project) (Restrepo, 2011: 15)

With this research focus we approach the study of the comments in Tod@s and BP, having a prototypical blog form with an administrator that posts content and a comments section (Yus-Ramos, 2010). These online logs operate as public spheres where discursive battles occur that are structured via the interactions that take place there, by way of individual and collective identity configurations of the users and via the uses they make of these sites.

Although meanings, representations and actions of co-construction of social reality are defined and negotiated on the Internet, you have to distinguish it from other media given that it is an informational-communicational structure and at the same time a cultural forum where social action is framed (Jensen, 2011). Think of the internet as a global space of flows, as Manuel Castells (2003) suggests, implies recognizing that there are relationships of power and anti-establishment movements. Internet studies should take on the task of studying the dynamics of power and cultural dominance for the addressing of conflicts as well as the political processes and the exercising of citizenship that occurs on social networks (Ess & Consalvo, 2011).

Thanks to its connection with feminist and queer theories, Internet studies can show the extrapolations and translations of the binary and heterosexist intelligibility nuances that run throughout virtual communities by incorporating key concepts like that of gender and sexuality with the purpose of identifying new digital modes of oppression and resistance as well as new mechanisms of construction of the sameness and the otherness (Bromseth & Sundén, 2011). At this intersection of theories and themes is where our work arises, whose last objective is to analyze the discriminatory digital representations in regards to LGBTIQ people on two pages where the legitimacy of the recently passed legal and judicial achievements were disputed.

As we said, we carried out our communicational study with a feminist and queer perspective. Particularly, here we followed the theories of Paul B. Preciado (2002, 2008) and Judith Butler (1990, 2002, 2004, 2009), who show the regulatory forces of the discourses on the genres that establish and build up unequal power relationships, based on the physical or cultural attributes that naturally occur to hide the fact they are a result of a series of performative acts that support them over time. The authors seek the deconstruction and subversion of these normative discourses on the genres and sexualities that at the same time enable censorship of certain ways of being, say and do with the purpose of doing away with the excluding processes regarding the bodies, desires and practices that stray from the heteronormativity and the man/woman fictional binomial.

Queer theories, similar to cultural studies, offer a framework for the intellectual and political action with the purpose of denouncing the material and symbolic injustices that harm different sectors of the population upon converting their differences into conditions of inequality. In this sense, it is necessary to advance in a direction that contributes to eradicating said injustices. Here we will analyze violent comments, understanding that the violent is the transgression of the prohibited

in that it marks the limit of a culture and its system of rules. According to Sergio Tonkonoff (2014), violence enables the showing of the surpassing or rupture of the symbolic border of what is socially acceptable and for that reason it is rejected as it vulnerates the values held and defended by a group or collective. The definition of what it is a violent is itself is situational and subject to systems of moral classification that repel and distance themselves from certain actions, beliefs, objects and people. The oppositional delimitation between the internal and external, good and threatening, plays an important role in society in terms of the creation and conservation of a particular order in an attempt to restore a symbolic order in a society whose pillars are collapsing into postmodernity. The comments of our corpus are inscribed in said context and show that violence is not only a social problem but also a useful category for cultural analysis.

3. Methodological Framework

To investigate the social processes of negotiation of meanings in the blogs here we build a mainly qualitative methodological strategy (Orozco-Gómez, 1996). To start, we approach the sites periodically via non-participative processes of observation following the contributions of Christine Hine (2000) on virtual ethnography. We see that between 2012 and 2015, 406 articles were posted in the blogs, but we opted to work with the 10 most commented on examples from a total of 5,095 comments. Then we use photography techniques and screen shots to collect comments and finally we used a script to quantify and label them².

In 2015, we interviewed the administrators of each blog, Verónica Dema (BP) and Bruno Bimbi (Tod@s). The interviews were individual and semi-structured and we created a protocol that worked as a guide (Ander-Egg, 1990). The questions were: 1) How did the blog come about? 2) Who is it for? 3) What

are the more or less frequent users like? 4) Why do you think you were chosen to administrate the blog? How did you get here? 5) What stance do users comments have? 6) What is the role of the moderator? 7) Who is in charge of moderating the content posted? 8) What is the purpose of the moderator role and the conditions and restrictions of use of the blog? 9) What characteristics do the moderated texts have? and 10) What is the opinion of the activity of the moderator when faced with the violent or discriminatory comments and a the possibility of violating the right to communicate?

Later, in 2016, we counted and classified the comments using the program *Atlas.ti* based on interviews that we had with Dema and Bimbi, who sustained that in their blogs there were "two bands" of commenters: we took their observations and with the already outlined definitions, we created the categories "violent" and "non-violent". We took a random sample of 589 comments from a total of 5,095 with a 5% margin of error and a 99% confidence interval. We divided them by blog and by type of participation (violent or non-violent) in relation to each group, one made up of the LGBTIQ people and their allies (LGBTIQyA) and another made up of people that distance themselves from the first (non-LGBTIQyA). See table below (Figure 1):

Figure 1. Classification of comments into percentages

	Comentarios	Boquitas	Tod@s
No violento sobre no-LGBTIQyA	30,64	38,98	
Violento sobre no-LGBTIQyA	26,81	10,73	
No violento sobre LGBTIQyA	11,91	28,53	
Violento sobre LGBTIQyA	30,64	21,75	
Total	100,00	100,00	

Source: made and calculated by author.

We observed that in BP, more than half of the comments are violent and the majority attacks

LGBTIQyA people. In contrast, in Tod@s, most are non-violent exchanges, although mainly LGBTIQyA people are attacked when there are violent comments.

Although the previous table (Figure 1) gives information on the number of violent participations that occur in each blog, it does not give details about the content or the representations that they hold. We use the theories and methods the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) offer from its socio-linguistic aspect to understand the relationship between word and power. According to Ruth Wodak:

The CDA allows us to analyze the pressure coming from above and the possibilities of resistance to the unequal power relationships that appear in the form of social conventions. According to this point of view, the dominating structures stabilize the conventions and convert them into something natural. In other words, the effects of power and of ideology in the production of meaning are dimmed and acquire stable natural forms: they are considered as something "given". The resistance is thus considered as a rupture of the conventions and of the stable discursive practices, as an act of "creativity" (Wodak, 2003a: 3)

According to the author, people resort to different discursive strategies to mark their value stances over other subjects or processes. Through them, social relationships of identity and of difference are established and show in a positive light the belonging group and the "other" in a negative light. These strategies are the reference or nomination, the predication, the argumentation, the perspective and the intensification or mitigation (2003b). In addition, we take the contributions of Nora Kaplan (2004) and Peter White (2004) on the theory of the valuation for analysis of the attitude and value stances of the users on the others, their comments and the processes on which they converse. Likewise, they enable us to investigate the mechanisms with which they negotiate these values and relationships are established between users with more or less similar positions.

4. Analysis

4.1. "Is this a blog or a ghetto?": Appropriations of space

In our universe of analysis, anti-establishment meanings come into play that allow us to define the existence of two groups, that we define loosely for the analytical purposes of this work. On one hand, we find those who position themselves on a similar ideological line of that of the administrator of each blog and that of the guest authors, where they coincide in defending the rights of people with dissident genders and sexualities. On the other hand, there are those who distance themselves from the perspective of the announcers. Both parties participate in the comments section to express their agreement or disagreement on topics like same sex marriage, legal recognition of transgender identity, adoption and single parenthood, among others. In these dialogue exchanges, we observe that there was simultaneous debate on the right to free speech and the right to a life free of discrimination. Thus, some of the users that we classified in the second group looked negatively upon the activity of moderating or deleting comments, which they called an act of censorship. At the same time, they identified the blogs and their moderators, and LGBTIQyA people with the label of "ghetto".

We start with text that we extracted para titular this section:

Andres Sotto a Mia L: what happened here??? when I was trying to reply to a comment I get a message that says it was deleted by the moderator, and there was nothing offensive in it. Is this a blog or a ghetto?? [...]

Apart from the denouncement of censorship, here Andrés Soto negatively classifies the BP blog for deleting content for reasons other than being offensive. His accusation is similar to that of other BP commenters, like in these examples:

manuel to Roy: that's the way it is roy, they have censored several of my comments...and then the homosexuals complain that they are discriminated against!!! but they are the first to lock themselves in a ghetto and not allow well-supported adverse expressions.

susana to Dixon: [you guys] blogs like this one are created to attract a social majority... take it... you are nothing more than a ghetto.

In the first case, the user manuel complains about the deletion of his text and, with it, his own exclusion. With a similar position, the user susana is ironic about the motivation behind the creation of the blog and once again denominates this space (and its participants) as a ghetto. The three commenting users allow for the drawing of a provisory semantic chain, that associates the group of LGBTIQyA people with censorship, discrimination and formation of sectarian groups. In other words, according to these opinions, non-heterosexual people exclude themselves and discriminate against cis heterosexual subjects mainly for their religious beliefs, for their sexual orientation and for not accepting their "deliriums", as seen in other texts.

Comments like that of susan receive replies that resist and put into circulation affirmative meanings on space and negative meanings about their detractors:

Karen Bennett to susana: Based on what I've seen, you are attracted to the ghetto. You are always on it.

Juan Carlos Díaz to susana: No, it's not that they don't want to intermix or be part of the social majority, but they do want to avoid that minority of people like you, that scorn and openly show their disgust of them. I wouldn't blame anybody for that.

If blogs dedicated to the topic of sexual diversity are or are not a ghetto depends on the discursive position of the speaker. In these last replies you can see two complementary ideas: the first, is the defense for social integration and, the second, the appropriation of a spa-

ce that in ideally speaking represents an open site for people that, according to Juan Carlos Díaz, "scorn and openly show their disgust for them" (LGBTIQ people), in rejection of those who offend them.

Nevertheless, the comments of Karen Bennett, also in an ironic tone, adds a third element: the questioning of the reasons that drive someone to participate in the blogs of those people that distance themselves from the demands of the LGBTIQ collective. Another user makes a similar contribution and writes:

Maria to Miguel Andrada: [...] why do people come to this blog and get upset about what they see knowing beforehand what they were going to find. Are you going to tell me that those clicking on a blog named Boquitas Pintadas, that claims to be gay friendly, that has a rainbow flag and posts titles like "Anita and her two mothers"³, a children's story about accepting family diversity, thought they were going to find a list of the saints? Perhaps they should ask themselves, what they are doing here if it bothers them so.

Maria lists some graphic and textual elements that refer to the identification of the blog with a space for the LGBTIQ community: the image of the gay pride flag, the name of the blog, its slogan and its contents. Here once again the questioning (and the rejection) of non-tolerant participation of the announcer is reiterated, like that in this excerpt:

principio de viana reino navarr to Andres Sotro: [...] This is how your comments should start, "I, heterosexual homophobic and believer in a Gay friendly blog demand that:". How long are you going to continue to accuse us of being AIDS carriers, since for decades we know that is a sexually-transmitted disease to which all sexually-active people are exposed? Got anything new? Any other accusations that you haven't used yet? Anything else you can use to insult or lie about? Buy a dog and take it out for a walk instead of making ridiculous comments since you are not even interested in the arti-

cles that Verónica [Dema] posts. You are not even trying to understand the position of people like us who are born with a different sexual condition which is what comes with a gay-friendly blog.

In this comment we note that there is not only a sense of belonging towards the blog but also an identity construction of a “we” and a “them”: the first, that they are accused of being sick, and those that are their accusers. Moreover, the user principle... positively values Dema, the space and its posts, created to bring people into understanding with one another, the opposite of what Andres Sotto does. From one place or another, the discursive positions of each participant can be summarized in a formula where We = positive, and Others = negative. Who belongs to each group is indistinct: the operations of defense of “we” and of scorn and/or attack towards the “others” seem to be exchangeable. In each case, the equations is We = victims, Other = perpetrators; We = normal, Others = abnormal.

Finally, we see that opposite spatial appropriations coexist in regards to both pages: on one hand, there are those who see a blog as an open public space, that can be visited and used by anyone; but, at the same time, there are those who see it as a private site, where you can participate behind closed doors only if you follow the “house” rules. And like any private place, you can enter to be sheltered from the rest, something that is consistent with the idea of refuge that LGBTIQyA people describe in some of their comments: you will remember that they said they looked to the blog as a space of dialogue that would be discrimination free. What external subjects see as “ghetto”, those that demand the legitimacy of their feeling of territoriality present it as a safe place.

4.2. “Come here to leave your hate”: sense of belonging

Both in Tod@s and BP, violent discursive practices occur that close the dialogues and can

lead to the exclusion of participants. In these exchanges, the guiding principle is the struggle for respect. Nevertheless, likewise a sense of belonging is disputed that refers to the identification of a group with the digital space. As an example, here we show a Tod@s comment and BP comment. In Tod@s we see a dialogue between Bimbi and a user, which ends like this:

EMILIANO to Bruno Bimbi: YOU CAME OUT BACKWARDS. THERE IS ONLY BLACK AND WHITE. WHAT COLOR ARE YOU? GO BUY SOME VASELINE AND DO WHAT YOU DO, SAY NO MORE ATHIEST

Bruno Bimbi to EMILIANO: This is my blog. Did you know? If you continue insulting or speaking with that vulgar, rude and violent tone, he who will say no more here will be you.

Bimbi is the administrator of Tod@s and participates more frequently than Dema given that he posts 213 and she only 1. In the comment here he replies to EMILIANO with a threat in order to prevent him from posting comments considered violent, not only for the attacks there are in this and previous comments, but also for the use of capital letters, that represent a scream or an attack according to the rules of internet courtesy (Yus-Ramos, 2010).

In the second case, the user scorns the blog member, attacks and questions him for his reasons for joining the blog. Dice:

Karen Bennett to Fernando Galmarini: in addition to showing that you are still living in the middle ages, could you please tell us what the hell you are doing participating in a LGBT blog?

In the corpus we find other comments with violent content that were written in response to those identified as attackers; this is regardless of the group to which they belong. In other words, if there is a LGBTIQ person that threatens the values of a non-LGBTIQ people, they will attack him as a mechanism to preserve the values that he is endangering. On the other hand, if a per-

son threatens the ideals or principles of LGBTIQ people, they resort to violence to subdue or eliminate the risk of loss that the "other" embodies. This exemplifies the conservative potential of violence that Tonkonoff speaks of (2014).

Violence is used to ward off all that which represents a danger to "us". However, we must reiterate that the categories of sameness and otherness, violent or non-violent, depend on the position of each speaker. As Teun van Dijk says:

The overall strategy of a positive self-presentation and a negative presentation of the others is very typical in this biased description of the events in favor of one's own interests, while the actions and negative situations are blamed on the opponents or the others (Van Dijk, 2006: 64)

The definition of violence is contextual and varies according to the implication of the protagonists and witnesses: it will never be said that someone from the in-group is violent and less if he believes he is under attack. No matter what, you have to protect the belonging group (and their territory) in the face of a danger that comes from outside at the hand of an "other".

4.3. Blogging sexual dissidence

The question we have to know who is who in each blog leads us to interview Dema and Bimbi. The first thing we asked about was their target: Who is each blog directed towards? Both responded: "to everyone". However, the journalists identified the existence of "two bands" and carry out a classification identical to ours. Bimbi argues that cis heterosexual people participate in blogs to "spit their hate" defend a traditional heterosexual parental family model. For Dema, people go to her blog in order to attack are making fewer and fewer LGBTIQ people want to participate. In other words, these spaces are taken over by people that offend and chase away others. The idea of taking over or occupying a foreign property are key when seeing how people react to ward off or exclude those trying to occupy.

We found that 52.4% of the comments were against LGBTIQ people, such as these:

Lore Zepp: [...] all I can say is that you are one more of those male sluts that stupidly let people rip your butt and on top of it now you want us to pay you a subsidy??? go get a job faggot...!!

mila ferreiro: Reading the different opinions on this blog what I see is that the only intolerant people are those that belong to and follow the gay community. You are the ones that insult those on the other side. Is that what you call tolerance, that which you ask so much for? There is so much hate in your hearts. [...]

Some comments confuse sexual orientation with gender identity and associate trans identities with homosexuality, transvestitism, with drag queening, with prostitution and participating passively in anal sex, to which they give a negative sense and use them as a tool of personal attack to scorn blog members.

The responses received are diverse and some lead to a *continuum* of violence. There are users from an opposite position that call for respect:

C Méndez to Raul Montefiore: If I enter a space, let's say for Catholics, I can say "I'm atheist" like here any run of the mill heterosexual can contribute and give their opinion but I'm not going to go calling people crazy or jerks. Either way, the cases are totally different. If a person decides to believe in supernatural beings, it's their decision. Entering a space defined as "gay friendly" and treat people as abnormal is like entering a space for Africans and calling them monkeys or a space for Jewish people and citing 'Mein Kampf' ...

This comment also outlines a sense of property and belonging. Moreover, it establishes a notion of a "should do", that contradicts with the expectation of equal treatment in a space where you call and advocate for a dialogue of equality. Blogs are *gay-friendly* spaces and

one would expect participants to be LGBTIQyA. Based on this criterium, people that assign categories of “abnormality” to other people motivated by their gender or sexuality do not belong in this blog, as well as those that use terms associated with racial or religious discrimination do not belong to a blog of Africans or Jewish, taking the words of C Méndez.

Therefore, not only does it construct the we/ them dichotomy binomial but it also shows the creation of a here as a mobile spatiality given multiple meanings. An inside and an outside is drawn and creating a sense of privacy where you can constantly dispute the title rights of said property. Moreover, the comments sections of the blogs operate like fighting rings where meanings are negotiated and limits are set on what is acceptable and what is tolerable, while at the same time, there is participation from different people according to the group they belong to or of reference. In this sense, offensive discursive practices are executed that put the group which they attack at risk but at the same time show that their unit itself is being threatened.

As seen, blog administrators attest to a sense of violence in the comments of non-LGBTIQ people. However, at the same time we observe the coexistence of violent modes that seek the exclusion and elimination of the non-LGBTIQ discursive opponent via the belittling of their persona and of the places he claims as his own. Some of these operations include the re-definition of the political meanings behind concepts like that of discrimination and that of the ghetto. The previous commentary enables us to see that just as there are those who give a derogatory sense to the web platform, there are other users that expected to find in each blog a safe place free of discrimination.

Along these lines, the blog administrators desire multiple receivers but legitimize the sense of belonging to LGBTIQyA people upon indicating that they are attacked and victimized by people who only go to the blog to attack them. People that receive a hostile

comment on behalf of a user tend to be more vulnerable to more attacks if they decide to reply to it. As a result, they opt to not respond or stop participating in these spaces.⁴ Dema pays particular attention to the comments section of articles where topics linked to trans populations are addressed to see that they attack them using pronouns that do not respect their genders. She said she could understand the hurtful that this could be to trans people when a commenting user refers to her insisting on using masculine pronouns.

The existence of a group of *haters* is similar to that of users that denounce the existence of organized commenting users or *trolls*, figure that intentionally spread false rumors, transmits personal attacks and deviates topics of discussion that the authors of web content propose (Myers, 2010).

One user says to another:

Josedelbarrio to claudiogn: [...] you show that, as a good *troll*, the only thing you are interested in is attacking and confusing. There is really no point arguing with *trolls*, since the constructive dialogue is not the purpose of their participation in a forum, but at least it is constructive expose them as such.

Josedelbarrio suggests that the objective of the *trolls*' comments is not to converse but to bother others. But we could complete his statement by adding:

Included in the direct effects of cyberattacks are inhibition and self-censorship that is not only direct, that is to say, of the people attacked, but also the disciplining of the environment as a result of a lesson, that is produced in people who agree or think similarly to the position of the attacked. [...] In this sense, the cyberattacks operate a moral economy that aims to directly or indirectly dissuade the posting or sharing of discourses considered unwanted, to the point that their circulation would provoke harassment. The discipline sought by the cybertroops is silence or changing the topic of discussion (Amnesty International, 2018: 8)

Moreover, according to Majid KhosraviNik (2017: 593), the problematic appropriations of digital public space lead to the installation and consolidation of a type of discourse. In the case of the users that are described as *trolls*, the discourse that disseminate is not only cis heterosexual but also one that positions them as victims of LGBTIQ people: these are intolerant, discriminatory, violent, sick, perverse and selfish people that represent the end of the values of a "normal" society. As Bimbi said in the interview, the activity of these commenting users inhibits the participation of the rest and for this reason the blogs are appropriated by haters. This sentence allows us to catch a glimpse of the vision of the blogger of who for him are those who have the right to use the blog: LGBTIQyA people.

5. Conclusions

This investigation analyzed how meanings for denomination and appropriation of daily Argentine blogs are disputed. We found that the responses to the questions for the senses of belonging to the blogs are interchanging and that the notions of property are constantly questioned by discussing the right of permanence and pertinence in each blog. We noted that on neither of the sites there is consensus on who are the owners of each site: those who give themselves the right of ownership do everything possible to inhibit or destroy the participation of those that invade foreign territory via attacks, insults and other strategies to belittle discursive opponents.

While some users hold discourses that contributed to the inequality of the LGBTIQ people via the use of name calling and disparaging preaching in regards to them and the spaces they called their own, likewise people of that collective at times responded with violent commentaries to defend themselves from hostile comments they received and attack others. In both cases, the "others" were the face of evil, of risk or threat: the evaluation of their potential danger justified the taking of violent mea-

asures to soften or eliminate said danger. They were the cis heterosexual users on one side, and the sexual dissidents on the other. It was argued that the first wanted to diminish the rights established by the LGBTIQ population, while it was said that the latter sought out laws that gave the privileges at the cost of the rest of society.

The novelty of this study regarding a previous investigation (Pérez Riedel, 2014) is that now the assertion as victims of oppression that formed part of the political struggles of the LGBTIQ movements is reappropriated by the people that distance themselves from the collective and they subvert it in a way that, according to their discourse, they become those that suffer discrimination. In other words, in some comments the meanings of victim/aggressor are reversed and they claim that homosexual people are attacking and violating the rights of those who are not. All this is done with the purpose of implementing a morality against-nature as a normal option that circulates in different ways among society, one of them being the creation of these blogs in digital press. Some conservative religious sectors even refer to the propagation of a "gender ideology" at the hand of the gay lobby, that distorts language, truth and justice to show "gay marriage" or homosexual marriage in a favorable light, while at the same time it distances society from nature and of the word and will of God (Monedero, 2016).

The comments sections of these sites are set up as spaces of hetero and homo resistance in that the users negotiate meanings that put the legitimacy of their identities, rights, and complaints into dispute. But these processes go hand in hand with discursive mechanisms of positive and negative evaluation of the processes, events and subjects on which they write, and that define the social limits of the acceptable, the good, the just and the desirable. In this set of meanings, social change is promoted and resisted. In terms of the blogs, users exercise their citizen participation. Each commentary, whether explicitly or implicitly, proposes meanings of equality, justice and

democracy. Here, recognition of denial of the LGBTIQ collective rights operates in harmony with opening or closing processes of the geographic material and symbolic borders that validate or invalidate them in the personal and political realms when commenting on the internet.

Notes

1. For example, the Law of Gender Identity (No. 26,743/2012) gives access to registration changes for legal recognition of gender for transsexuals and provides the possibility to receive free hormone and surgical treatment; Nation Law No. 26,791/2012 modifies Article 80 of the Argentine Penal Code to address hate crimes based on gender, sexual orientation, gender identity and its expression; the Law of Cupo Laboral Trans of the Province of Buenos Aires (No. 14,783/2015) and the Law of the City of Buenos Aires against Discrimination (No. 5,261/2015). In those years the possibility of updating the Law Punishing Discriminatory Acts (No. 23,592/1988) was debated in order to include discrimination of sexual orientation and identity and gender expression. Also national educational workshops were held and promoted for teachers on integral sexual education. During the Fernán-

dez's first term as president the Law on Same-sex Marriage (No. 26,618/2010) was passed, giving same-sex couples marriage and adoption rights.

2. We thank engineer Leonel Bracco (IIB-NTECH / UNSAM) for his technical assistance.

3. Dema, V. (November 19, 2013). 'Anita y sus dos mamás', un cuento infantil para pensar las familias diversas [blog entry], *Boquitas pintadas*. Found on August 20th, 2018 at <http://blogs.lanacion.com.ar/boquitas-pintadas/arte-y-cultura/anita-y-sus-dos-mamas-un-cuento-infantil-para-pensar-las-familias-diversas/>

4. In another investigation, we interviewed LGBTIQ activists on discrimination on the internet (Pérez Riedel, 2018). The interviewees agree that discriminatory comments on the web affect their audience just as if it were done off the web. And although it is unlikely that perpetrators of cyberattacks have the intention of physically harming their victims, it is possible that they affect them in other ways that may lead to extreme behaviors such as suicide. When they were asked what they would do in the case of discrimination, they proposed deleting or blocking the undesired comments, decide if their attacks configuran a real risk and go to the authorities if necessary.

Bibliographic References

- Amnistía Internacional (2018) *Limited Public Debate: Trolling and attacks on free speech of journalists and human rights defenders on Twitter Argentina* (report). Recuperado el 20 de agosto de 2018 de <https://amnistia.org.ar/wp-content/uploads/delightful-downloads/2018/03/online-pre1.pdf>
- Ander-Egg, E. (1990). "Phases and instrumentation of the processes of Participative Action-Investigation". En *Repensando la Investigación-Acción-Participativa* (pp. 61-114). Buenos Aires: Lumen Hvmanitas.
- Bromseth, J. & Sundén, J. (2011). "Queering Internet studies: Intersections of gender and sexuality". En Consalvo, M. & Ess, C. (eds.), *The Handbook of Internet Studies* (pp. 271-299). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender in dispute: Feminism and subversion of identity*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Butler, J. (2002). *Bodies that matter: On limits, materials and discourses of "sex"*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Breaking down gender*. Barcelona: Paidós Ibérica.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Language, power and identity*. Madrid: Síntesis.

- Castells, M. (2003). *The information era: Economy, society and culture*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Ess, C. & Consalvo, M. (2011). "What is 'Internet Studies'?". En *The Handbook of Internet Studies* (pp. 1-8). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hall, S. (2010). *Without guarantees: Trajectories and challenges in cultural studies*. Popayán: Envión.
- Hine, C. (2000). *Virtual ethnography*. Londres: Sage.
- Jensen, K. (2011). "New media, old methods – Internet methodologies and the online/offline divide". En Consalvo, M. & Ess, C. (eds.), *The Handbook of Internet Studies* (pp. 43-58). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kaplan, N. (2004). New developments in the study of evaluation in language: The theory of valuation. *Boletín de Lingüística*, 22, 52-78. Recuperado el 20 de agosto de 2018, de <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=34702203>
- KhosraviNik, M. (2017). "Social Media Critical Discourse Studies (SM-CDS)". En Flowerdew, J. & Richardson, J. (eds.), *Handbook of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 582-596). Londres: Routledge.
- Marin, L. (2009). Power, representation, image. *Prismas*, 13, 135-153. Recuperado el 10 de octubre de 2018 de <http://www.unq.edu.ar/advf/documentos/51f6a2f59bbe8.pdf>
- Martín Barbero, J. (2010). "Notes on making memory of the cultural investigation in Latin America". En Richard, N. (ed.), *En torno a los estudios culturales. Localidades, trayectorias y disputas* (pp. 133-142). Santiago de Chile: ARCIS-CLACSO.
- Monedero, J. C. (2016). *Language, ideology and power. Words as tools of ideological persuasion: culture and legislation*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Castilla.
- Myers, G. (2010). *Stance-taking and public discussion in blogs. Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(4), 263-275. doi:10.1080/17405904.2010.511832
- Pérez Riedel, M. (2014). *Gender and sexual diversity on the blog Boquitas pintadas*. Bernal: Unidad de Publicaciones del Departamento de Ciencias Sociales de la Universidad Nacional de Quilmes.
- Pérez-Riedel, M. (2018). "Homo and transphobia on the web: LGBT activist testimonies". En Tuñón Pablos, E. & Mena Farrera, R. (coords.), *Género y TIC* (pp. 235-266). Chiapas: ECOSUR.
- Preciado, P. B. (2002). *Contra-sexual Manifiesto*. Madrid: Opera Prima.
- Preciado, P. B. (2008). "Micropolitics of gender in the pharmacopornographic era. Experimentation, voluntary intoxication, mutation". En *Testo yonqui* (pp. 233-285). Madrid: Espasa.
- Restrepo, E. (2011). Cultural studies and education: Possibilities, urgencies and limitations. *Revista De Investigaciones*, 10 (1), 9-21. Recuperado el 20 de agosto de 2018, de http://www.ram-wan.net/restrepo/documentos/estudios_culturales_y_educacion.pdf
- Tonkonoff, S. (2014). "Violence, political and cultural. A theoretical approximation". En Blanco, A. & Sánchez, M. (eds.), *Violencia y cultura: Reflexiones contemporáneas sobre Argentina* (pp. 15-30). Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- Van Dijk, T. (2006). Discourse and manipulation: Theoretical discussion and some applications. *Signos*, 39(60), 49-74. Recuperado el 10 de octubre de 2018 de http://www.discursos.org/oldarticles/Discurso_y_Manipulacion.pdf

- White, P. (2004). An introductory tour through appraisal theory. Recuperado el 20 de agosto de 2018 de <http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/appraisaloutline/unframed/appraisaloutline.htm>
- Williams, R. (2000). "Dominance". In *Marxism and Literature* (pp. 129-136). Barcelona: Península.
- Wodak, R. (2003a). "What is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Summary of its history, fundamental concepts and its developments". En Meyer, M. & Wodak, R. (comps.), *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (pp. 17-34). Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Wodak, R. (2003b). "Historic Focus of Discourse". En Meyer, M. & Wodak, R. (comps.), *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (pp. 101-142). Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Yus Ramos, F. (2010). "Internet Social Networks: The Web 2.0". En *Ciberpragmática 2.0* (pp. 119-137). Barcelona: Planeta.

▾ About the author

Magalí Pérez-Riedel has a doctorate in Communication from Universidad Nacional de La Plata (Argentina) and is Communication professor and researcher. She is author of the book *Género y diversidad sexual en el blog Boquitas pintadas* (2014) and co-director of the university extension project Communication and Education Practices for Sex-gender Disobedience of the Universidad Nacional de Quilmes (2015-2017).

▾ ¿Cómo citar?

Pérez-Riedel, M. (2018). Espacio público digital, disputas y violencias: comentarios en dos blogs argentinos LGBTIQ. *Comunicación y Medios*, (38), 125-137.