

ANTI-GENDER DISCURSIVE PRACTICES ON INSTAGRAM: AN ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS ON A POST BY THE SUPREME COURT¹



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev6n4-448>

Submitted on: 11/27/2024

Publication date: 12/27/2024

Leonardo Alves dos Santos Correia².

ABSTRACT

In the field of law, LGBTI+ people have experienced several processes of exclusion and stigmatization due to gender identity and sexual orientation, needing to fight numerous disputes within the judiciary to have their rights recognized. At this point, there has been an important role of the Federal Supreme Court (STF) during the last few years. The objective of this essay was to carry out a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) based on the social manifestations broadcast on Instagram, see comments related to the publication in celebration of International LGBTQIAPN+ Pride Day made by the Court's official institutional profile in June 2023. It was intended, for this purpose, to have gender studies as a basis not only in the field of elaborations of women's existences, but in the conformation of a system that associates roles, performativities, sexualities and power, that is, an analytical leap to visualize the interferences of gender construction in all the bodies that inhabit this society. The analysis was operationalized by the categories of analysis of representational meaning, based on the linguistic categories of interdiscursivity and the modes of operation of ideology. As a result, we observed that anti-gender discourse is, above all, cisheteronormative and lgbtphobic, positioning people who are part of the LGBTI+ community in invisibility, abjection and exclusion.

Keywords: Antigender. LGBT. Critical Discourse Analysis. Cisheteronormativity.

¹ Paper presented at the XIII International Meeting of CONPEDI (Uruguay – Montevideo).

² Master's student in Law at the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE), scholarship holder of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES)

Specialist in Rights, Genders and Ethnic-Racial Relations from the University of Pernambuco (UPE)

Specializing in Human Rights and Contemporaneity at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA)

Bachelor of Laws from the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA)

Member of the Law and Sexuality Research Group (CNPq/UFBA)

Email: leonardo.correia@ufba.br

INTRODUCTION

We have witnessed several and significant discussions around issues of sexual and gender diversity, such as the disputes around sexualities in the school context (Lelis and Almeida, 2019) and the analysis of precedents involving discrimination based on sexual orientation (Deslandes, 2018), as well as their implications in the multiple spheres of production of human life, as Facchini and França (2020) point out, especially from the profound social changes experienced in the last 20 years. Such discussions have gained notoriety in the public debate, especially when we talk about guarantees of rights.

In the field of legal studies that dialogue with the categories of sexual and gender diversity, researcher Roger Raupp Rios (2008) points to a trend towards reflections that aim to analyze and overcome a culture of exclusion and stigmatization in relation to LGBTI+ people.

The social exclusion of LGBTI+ people, according to Pedra (2020, p. 25), is not an individual fact and can be understood as a multifactorial and multidimensional phenomenon. Multifactorial because it is produced from a combination of factors that can be historically analyzed along with morals, religion, culture and multidimensional because it reaches multiple dimensions of life, including legislative production and the guarantee of rights.

[...] In certain periods, a religious discourse prevailed that framed dissident sexualities and genders as sins. At other times, medical-scientific discourses that labeled as pathology or disease emerged with greater force. Sometimes, the legal and criminological views that reinforced the association of homosexualities with crimes and misdemeanors became hegemonic. Not to mention the journalistic and literary discourses that contributed to culturally decant stereotypes of LGBT people. All these discourses, despite the different weights and eventual disputes for space that they had in the different historical moments, mutually reinforced each other and potentiated sexual and gender discrimination. (QUINALHA, 2022, p. 613).

On the other hand, Bahia and Bomfim (2022) remind us that this powerful process of sexual and gender discrimination reaches people in different ways within the community itself, bringing as an example that gay cisgender men have, in general, greater access to rights compared to transvestites. This point brings us to the importance of law and public policies to consider intersectionality as an indispensable analytical key, considering diverse realities of race, class, ethnicity, disability, etc.

Addressing legislative production leads us to reinforce an extremely problematic topic within the scope of the Brazilian federal legislature, pointed out by several researchers

in the legal universe: a systematic omission and invisibilization of the agendas around the LGBTI+ population (CARRARA, 2010; PEDRA, 2020; RAMOS, NICOLI 2023).

This scenario, marked by the immobility and conservatism of the National Congress, as Carrara (2010) clearly demarcates, which culminates in the scarcity of legislative frameworks for the population in question, has had repercussions in other spheres, such as the judiciary, a historical stage of disputes and achievements of the LGBTI+ population in recent years. At this point, it is unquestionable to emphasize the prominence and importance of the decisions rendered by the Federal Supreme Court (STF).³

Although it is not the focus of this work, the disputes and achievements fought within the scope of the most important Court in the country can be verified in a recent publication entitled "Cadernos de Jurisprudence do STF: Concretizando Direitos Humanos", an initiative that aims to disseminate the decision-making profile of the STF on the subject of Human Rights, whose first volume was dedicated to the Rights of LGBTQIAP+ people, published in 2022, by the agency itself in partnership with the National Council of Justice (CNJ).

Recalling very briefly and without the intention of carrying out a detailed survey, we recall the performance of the Brazilian judiciary in recent years: initially, the ADI. 4,277 and ADPF. 132, judged in 2011, recognizing the right to union between people of the same sex; ADPF 291, partially upheld in 2015, in which the Federal Supreme Court considered unconstitutional the mention of homosexuality in article 235 of the Military Penal Code; Extraordinary Appeal 670,422 and ADI. 4,275, of 2018, recognizing the right to gender identity of trans people; in 2019, the Writ of Injunction 4,733 and ADO. 26, where it was decided to criminalize LGBTphobia through the framing of the conduct in the Racism Law (Law 7.716/89) and in 2020, in the ADI. 5543, the recognition of the right to blood donation by gay men, bisexuals, trans women and transvestites.

A brief incursion into the decisions handed down by the Supreme Court, especially from the handling of the work "Cadernos de Jurisprudence do STF: Concretizando Direitos Humanos – Direito das pessoas LGBTQIAP+" allows us to perceive that the body defends and assumes the agenda of enforcing human rights as a permanent and priority agenda. This spectrum of human rights includes the rights of LGBTI+ people.

³ The Federal Supreme Court, also known as the Supreme Court, is the highest body of the Judiciary, composed of 11 judges, whose competence rests, above all, on the protection of the Constitution, according to the propaganda mission of the aforementioned Court: To guarantee the supremacy of the Constitution, with respect to legal certainty, fundamental rights and the integrity of the Democratic Rule of Law.

By adopting such a stance, committed to human rights and the Democratic Rule of Law by ensuring rights that permeate the citizenship of LGBTI+ people in Brazil, the STF is confronted with a portion of the population marked by the LGBTIphobic, cisheteronormative, evangelical-neo-Pentecostal and, therefore, conservative posture. In this work, we understand this population as anti-gender actors who, according to Junqueira (2018, p. 451), start from a "reactionary, fundamentalist offensive of Catholic matrix and that unfolds on a transnational basis".

Notably, these offensives engage sectors and groups interested in promoting a morally regressive political agenda, especially (but not only) aimed at containing or annulling advances and transformations in relation to gender, sex, and sexuality, in addition to reaffirming traditionalist provisions, dogmatic doctrinal points, and "non-negotiable" religious principles. In the wake of these attacks, inflammatory discourses are constructed with a view to producing or feeding moral panic (Cohen, 1972, 2011), through political-discursive strategies aimed at regimenting society in a battle in defense of the "traditional family". This crusade implies intense political and discursive mobilization in favor of the reaffirmation of sexual hierarchies, of a so-called "primacy of parents in the moral and sexual formation of their children", of the withdrawal of sexuality education in schools, of the restriction of adolescents' access to information on sexual health, of the rejection of non-heteronormative family arrangements, the repathologization of homosexualities and transgenderisms, among other positions that represent restrictions on fundamental rights and guarantees (Junqueira, 2018, p. 451).

By adopting such a stance, committed to human rights and the Democratic Rule of Law by ensuring rights that permeate the citizenship of LGBTI+ people in Brazil, the STF is confronted with a portion of the population marked by the LGBTIphobic, cisheteronormative, evangelical-neo-Pentecostal and, therefore, conservative posture. In this work, we understand this population as anti-gender actors.

In view of this scenario, based on a qualitative, empirical and interdisciplinary research, based on a literature review, the objective of the work was to carry out a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) based on comments collected in a post in celebration of the International LGBTQIAPN+ Pride Day, within the scope of the Court's official Instagram profile, in June 2023.

ANTI-GENDER AGENDA AND BELIEFS OF SUPERIORITY

Denise Vitale and Renata Negamine (2018) point out that since the 2000s we have experienced a period marked by major social transformations, which have deserved attention from academia, especially with regard to gender debates. On the other hand, with the same intensity, we can follow the growing anti-gender wave around the world,

materialized in an "extensive production of books and courses taught by pastors, priests, and right-wing activists who propose a war against gender ideology" (Silva and Teixeira, 2021, p. 3044).

Luis Felipe Miguel (2021, p. 3) has situated this war as an agenda of the extreme right as a global phenomenon. For the author, in this scenario, violence is praised as a mechanism to resolve disagreements and equality and individual autonomy lose place due to the interest in maintaining a hierarchical and rigid social order through condemnation, deprivation and oppression. Crimes such as "racism, xenophobia, homophobia and misogyny cease to be shameful survivals to regain an ostensible centrality". That is why it is important that the legal world is not oblivious to this phenomenon that is worldwide.

Part of this socio-political scenario can be understood through the report Anti-Gender Policies in Latin America, published by the Observatory of Sexuality and Politics (SPW), a project of the Brazilian Interdisciplinary AIDS Association (ABIA), which, through case studies, dialogues about the disputes around sexual and gender diversity in several countries in the region.

In the aforementioned report, we are presented that the attack on gender began in the 1990s, provoked by the Vatican and its allies in reaction to the legitimization of the concept by the UN, through clerical writings and being a potent tool for unleashing waves of moral panic.

By attacking "gender ideology", conservative and right-wing forces provoke anxiety in people about the future of their families and, especially, their children. To overcome these fears, the remedy that religious conservative forces offer is an imaginary of security centered on the traditional family, the nation, and religious values. (Corrêa; Kalil, 2021, p. 196)

Corrêa and Kalil (2021) argue that "gender ideology" has been widely propagated in Latin America as an empty basket, involving multiple contents and targets, since it is versatile, popular, and common sense. By looking at the Latin American region, the authors note that the main arguments of the case studies are that anti-gender policies go beyond promoting outdated laws and policies regarding gender, sexuality and abortion, for example. The authors, by taking political trajectories in the region as their centrality, identify an incentive for the preservation or restoration of profoundly racialized and unequal sexual and gender orders.

The outlined scenario can be associated with the ideas defended by Icaro Bonamigo Gaspodini and Jaqueline Gomes de Jesus (2020) around heterocentrism and ciscentrism

as beliefs of superiority over sexual orientation, sex, and gender. This set of *superiority beliefs* act by allocating certain identities as central and superior to the detriment of identities as marginal and inferior. These beliefs would be part of a set of cultural learnings that, on occasion, "result in the propensity for daily practices of invisibilization and stigmatization of individuals belonging to these social groups considered inferior" (GASPODINI; JESUS, 2020, p. 5), reverberating through discriminatory discourses and language, jokes, silencing, and invisibility.

The term cisgender dialogues with the idea of identification of some people with the gender that was assigned to them at the time of birth, thus, the prefix from the Greek *cis* corresponds to the idea of "on this side" and starts to be used in an antagonistic position to people who do not identify with the gender that was assigned to them at the time of birth, corresponding to *trans people*, to which the prefix refers to the idea of "on the other side".

A ciscentric worldview would necessarily have two dimensions: first, it considers biological sex to be the determinant of gender – men are male and women are female (Butler, 1990) and, second, it considers that only two binary and excluding sexes are the standard of normality of genitalia and sexual characteristics (Machado, 2005, 2008). The first disregards the psychosocial character of the construction of genders and excludes people whose experience of gender is in disagreement with the notion of assigned sex. The second disregards the variability of anatomical-physiological characteristics such as diversity and positions as a defect or abnormality any sexual characteristic that is in disagreement with the male-female model. (BUTLER, 1990; MACHADO, 2005, 2008 apud GASPODINI; JESUS, 2020, p. 11).

On the other hand, dialoguing about heterosexuality leads us to speak from a position of privilege and imposition with regard to the understanding of what is meant by sexual orientation. This is because society determines, based on unquestionable conceptions, that people should always build loving and sexual relationships with people of the opposite gender. Thus, relationships built from non-heterosexual interests have been and continue to be historically made invisible and stigmatized.

According to Balirano and Borba (2020, p. 4), this moral crusade promoted by far-right groups and movements against gender equality has one objective: to reserve heteronormative family ethics, gender values, and naturalized hierarchies of the traditional roles of men and women in society. Miguel (2021, p. 3) when addressing this family, situates it in the traditional, heteronormative arrangement and based on paternal domination".

This crusade takes place, above all, from various discursive strategies mobilized by anti-gender actors, including the creation and use of scientific jargon, largely based on bionatural truths, as pointed out in the report *Anti-Gender Policies in Latin America*, published by the Observatory of Sexuality and Politics (SPW). According to the aforementioned report, these jargons end up enabling these actors to present themselves as rational, cohesive, objective figures, confronting the discourses of feminists and LGBTI+ activists, understood as ideologized postures. Next, we propose Chart 1, which summarizes some scientific jargon pointed out by the entity.

Chart 01 – Repertoires mobilized by anti-gender actors

JARGON	DESCRIPTION
GENDER IDEOLOGY	This jargon emerged in the 1990s, with the repulsion of the genre from the moment the term was legitimized by the UN. Currently, it is mobilized to cause moral panic, provoking a series of insecurities for people regarding the future of their families.
THE FAMILY	This jargon refers to a specific type of family: the heteroprocreative Christian family. In this discourse, this family model is the solution to all social problems.
HUMAN RIGHTS	By mobilizing this jargon, anti-gender actors sustain human rights in a limited, restrictive perspective and attached to the literalness of the law or treaties/agreements/conventions. This type of vision rejects the expansion and increase of human rights and any kind of extensive interpretation
LGBTI+ RIGHTS	This jargon is often used by anti-gender actors as they seek to point out the lack of legitimacy of rights conquered by the LGBTI+ community. From this discourse, they maintain that LGBTI+ rights are created/invented rights and that such rights are not equivalent to other social rights
WOMEN'S RIGHTS	This jargon is used while these actors claim to be the true defenders of women's rights, especially in the face of a blurring of male and female "natural roles" caused by feminism
NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY	This jargon is commonly mobilized by conservative religious actors and their state allies in the defense of national sovereignty in the face of progressive decisions that deal with these issues at the international level
RELIGIOUS FREEDOM	This jargon promotes a false dichotomy between the guarantee of sexual and reproductive rights and the protection of religious freedom, always placing them in a position of opposition
ORDEM NATURAL	This jargon is based on the absolute belief in an immutable natural/biological order

TOTALITARIAN MINORITIES	This jargon is based on the argument that the rights of the majority are threatened by the ideological imposition of a minority
-------------------------	---

Source: Observatory of Sexuality and Politics (SPW)

The resonance of these arguments in the discourses around "gender ideology" is very common and, from this scenario, we can analyze how they are both powerful for conservative struggle and fragile with regard to respect for diversity.

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

In the course of this work, we have adopted Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a critical perspective of knowledge production (van Dijk *et al.*, 2013) focused on social problems, whose emphasis is mediated through the analysis of the role of discourse in the (re)production of abuses of power and/or practices of domination. This analysis, according to Bonfim *et al.* (2022, p. 178), takes place within the materiality of discourse, "always considering the inseparable relationship between language and society and the correlation between text, discursive practice, and social practice".

The social problems faced by this research agenda are taken as an object of analysis "from a perspective coherent with the best interests of the dominated social groups" (van Dijk *et al.*, 2013, p. 353), in a posture of confronting social inequalities and breaking any intention to maintain a neutral social and political position.

The fact that ACD is interested in power, domination and social inequality makes it concerned with groups, organizations and institutions. This means that CDA needs to take into account the various forms of social cognition shared by collectivities: knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, norms, and values. (van Dijk *et al.*, 2013, p. 372)

According to the aforementioned author, in view of the demands and complex issues that are part of the scope of interest of the CDA, we must, based on multidisciplinary theories, take the complex relationships between discursive structures and social problems through a historical, cultural, socioeconomic, philosophical, logical or neurological approach, varying according to the object researched. To do so, we must "make choices and select the most relevant structures to be analyzed in the study of a social problem" (van Dijk, 2013, p. 356), after all, according to Colares (2014, p. 126), through discourse we can see meanings emerge.

According to the author, the language we adopt refers to our purposes, unveils our beliefs and values, as well as the notion of the world and the social group in which we are inserted, even serving as an instrument of ideological manipulation (Colares, 2014).

It can be stated that the CDA has a significant heterogeneity of approaches⁴. For methodological purposes, we need to explain the approach adopted by this work, even considering that "they all start from a social problem with the objective of making a critical and reflective discursive analysis aimed at emancipation and social justice" (Chagas and Paula, 2023, p. 4). Thus, this essay adopts the Dialectical-Relational (DR) approach, proposed by Norman Fairclough (2003), which starts from the contributions of Halliday's Functional Systemic Linguistics (FSL) and goes further, highlighting the identity function that was on the margins (Bonfim *et al.*, 2022).

To this end, Fairclough (2003 *apud* Bonfim *et al.*, 2022, p. 179) operationalizes three meanings present in the utterances, namely: the actional meaning, which "focuses on the text as a mode of interaction in social events"; the representational meaning, which "emphasizes the representation of aspects of the world - physical, mental, social - in texts"; and the identificational meaning, which "refers to the construction and negotiation of identities in discourse". (Resende; Ramalho, 2006, p. 60 *apud* Bonfim *et al.*, 2022, p. 179).

In this work, we are committed only to the representational meaning, based on the emphasis on interdiscursivity⁵ via lexicalization of meanings and the modes of operation of ideology proposed by Thompson (1995): legitimation, dissimulation, unification, fragmentation and reification and their respective typical strategies of ideological operation.

In legitimation we find the representation of relations of domination as legitimate. Some typical strategies of symbolic construction pertaining to legitimation are: rationalization, universalization, and narrativization. Rationalization is characterized by a chain of reasoning whose objective is to justify a set of relations. In universalization, certain interests are taken as general interests. In narrativization, some legitimation requirements inserted in stories belonging to the past legitimize the present (Colares, 2014).

In dissimulation, the relations of domination are presented in a hidden, obscured way or through the negation itself. Some typical strategies of symbolic construction pertaining to dissimulation are: displacement, euphemization, and trope. The displacement starts from

⁴ Chagas and Paula (2023, P. 4) point out: Norman Fairclough's Dialectic-Relational (DR); Historical-Discursive (HD) by Ruth Wodak and Reisigl; Sociocognitive (SC) by Van Dijk; Mautner's Corpus Linguistics (LiC); Device Analysis (DA) by Jager and Maier and Representation of Social Actors by Theo van Leeuwen.

⁵ Interdiscursivity can be understood as the context in which discourse is constituted through combinations of other discourses, that is, "the ability of a text to articulate several discourses" (Bonfim *et al.*, 2022, p. 179).

the contextual transposition of terms and expressions. Euphemization, in turn, acts on the positive valuation of institutions, actions, or relationships. The trope acts through figures of speech, such as metonymy and metaphor (Colares, 2014).

Unification as a general mode of operation of ideology symbolically translates the construction of a collective identity. Some typical strategies of symbolic construction pertaining to unification are: standardization and symbolization of unity. Standardization indicates the proposal of a standard reference that is taken as a maximum foundation shared by all. The symbolization of unity indicates the construction of symbols of unity that refer to collective identification (Colares, 2014).

Fragmentation translates the idea of segmenting people who may represent a threat to the dominant group. Some typical strategies of symbolic construction pertaining to fragmentation are: differentiation and purging of the other. Differentiation permeates the emphasis on characteristics that can disunite people. The purging of the other can be translated into the symbolic construction of the being or group as an enemy (Colares, 2014).

Reification, as a general mode of operation of ideology, operates by portraying a transitory situation as permanent and/or natural. Some typical strategies of symbolic construction pertaining to reification are: naturalization, eternalization, and nominalization/passivation. Naturalization, as its name suggests, tends to give a natural character to social and historical creations. Eternalization treats social events and phenomena as permanent. Nominalization/passivation points to the overlapping of certain themes to the detriment of others, erasing events and actors (Colares, 2014).

Ideology for Colares (2014) operates through language, partially constituting what we can call reality. Based on Thompson (1985) and, consequently, on a critical conception of ideology, the author demarcates that it is concerned with "the way in which subjects engage in processes of transformation, destruction or reinforcement of their relationships with others and with the social real" (Colares, 2014, p. 126).

ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS

We selected, for analysis purposes, three comments from the publication made on the official instagram of the Federal Supreme Court, which dealt with the International LGBTQIAPN+ Pride Day and highlighted the importance of building a more inclusive and egalitarian society.

Regarding the selection criteria, we highlight the interest in comments that were directly related to the themes of equality, inclusion and LGBTI+ pride for the LGBTI+ community or discursive positions around "gender ideology".

Chart 2 – "Equality is not that. (...) That's just sealing."

USER	COMMENT
@elrisonasantoss	"Equality is not that. Equality is quality health for all, safety for all, quality of life for all, and so on... Inclusion is when they take courses such as: Libras, how to get along with an autistic person and so on. Inclusion is having streets and environments suitable for wheelchair users, the blind, in short. That's just sealing."

Source: Authorial elaboration. Extracted from the Instagram of the Supreme Court.⁶

Commonly, one of the discursive strategies mobilized by anti-gender groups revolves around affirming that the rights of LGBTI+ people are not legitimate because they would be deviant from legal instruments or because they have not historically been previously contemplated in these instruments. In this sense, according to Corrêa and Kalil (2021, p. 198), "these new rights have no equivalence with other rights, such as those related to access to water or education, or much less with democratic deficits." Such a scenario can also be interpreted in the light of the reflections of Adilson Moreira (2017) when he states that privileged groups see as threats the struggles of minorities for rights that the majority groups already have.

Dissimulation (a mode of operation of ideology) can be used as a mechanism where relations of domination move towards a process of concealment, denial or obscuration, as carried out by the user to divert attention from the relationship of domination under the rights of inclusion and equality aimed at the LGBTI+ community. Such a general mode of operation occurs in the case analyzed via **displacement** strategy, via terms or expressions. For the author, equality has nothing to do with tensions around LGBTI+ rights in Brazil. The rights for this community, based on equality and inclusion for the author, are considered, according to her choice of expression "**lacrção**", while she makes a list of situations of access to rights that are considered, by her, equality.

⁶ Available at: <https://www.instagram.com/p/Ct9Fhb-vVPO/>. Accessed on: 18 Dec. 2023.

Chart 3 – "When will they feel proud to be honorable, workers, citizens, dignified people?"

USER	COMMENT
@patriciatelli	"When will they feel proud to be honorable, hardworking, citizens, dignified people? What an inversion of values."

Source: Authorial elaboration. Extracted from the Instagram of the Supreme Court.⁷

Caio Pedra (2020, p. 17) warns us that sexual and gender oppressions often establish reduced standards of normality, in a way that promotes the hierarchization of subjects, as demonstrated in the perception of the comment made above, where the network user suggests that LGBTI+ people are not worthy or endowed with citizenship to the point of being proud of themselves. This normality, on occasion, is familiar with what Letícia Nascimento (2021, p. 93) explains to us, when she says that "throughout history, an immense legal, medical, political, religious, and educational discursive apparatus has tried to institute the hegemonic standard of the white, Christian, heterosexual, bourgeois, without disabilities, and thin man as a measure for all other 'things.'"

In this sense, it is also worth reaffirming, according to Pedra (2020), that the notion of subject of law, in the field of sexuality, has historically been related to a very specific group in society: cisheteronormative people. It is possible to recognize, therefore, the operation of the ideology of **Fragmentation**, where the segmentation of individuals and groups that may represent a threat to the dominant group takes place, through the strategy of **purging the other**, that is, the symbolic construction of an enemy: the LGBTI+ community in comparison to the cisheteronormative community is not formed by honorable people, by people who achieve dignity through work, who are endowed with citizenship and, finally, with human dignity. The cisheteronormative community creates the narrative of "totalitarian minorities", due to their dissident gender and sexuality performances inverting the hegemonic pattern. The so-called totalitarian minorities, according to the anti-gender booklet, threaten the rights of the majority through ideological imposition.

Chart 4 – "(...) They are creating real monsters against the Brazilian family"

USER	COMMENT
@arleansantoss	"It was supposed to demand respect if they want to be respected they are creating real monsters against the Brazilian family, disrespecting good people and still want to be respected"

Source: Authorial elaboration. Extracted from the Instagram of the Supreme Court.⁸

⁷ Available at: <https://www.instagram.com/p/Ct9Fhb-vVPO/>. Accessed on: 18 Dec. 2023.

⁸ Available at: <https://www.instagram.com/p/Ct9Fhb-vVPO/>. Accessed on: 18 Dec. 2023.

In chart 1, we mention, among the repertoires adopted by anti-gender actors, the jargon "family". In the case of figure 3, we have an illustration of what we brought in the table. The LGBTI+ community is bestified and is considered an affront to the Brazilian family. But, then, what would be the Brazilian family? The Brazilian family would be the heteroprocreative Christian family and also the monogamous one. Here it is clear that the LGBTI+ community is a problem for families precisely because they could not reach this family level, since they are not good people and because they are guided by the principle that the family is made up only of men and women (cisgender, of course).

In figure 3, it is also possible to identify operations of ideology, in addition **to Fragmentation**, discussed earlier, we observe unification, which through standardization indicates the "universal" reference to family, shared by all anti-gender actors.

CONCLUSION

The interdiscursivity present in the discourses demonstrates how negative beliefs and attitudes aimed at a certain social group give rise to naturalized discriminatory behaviors. Violence against sexual and gender diversity, with an LGBTIphobic trait, presents itself as a social, historical, cultural and totally naturalized process, as demonstrated in the comments made on the post made by the Supreme Court.

Most of the comments present in the publication, especially those chosen by this work to be analyzed in depth, assume a position of superiority while denying the citizenship and dignity of LGBTI+ people, since they, in the eyes of anti-gender actors, cannot even have the right to have rights.

What can be seen through the comments is that the anti-gender discourse is, above all, cisheteronormative and lgbtphobic, positioning people who are part of the LGBTI+ community in invisibility, abjection and exclusion, confronting several guarantees enshrined in the Federal Constitution of Brazil and that have been routinely debated within the scope of the Federal Supreme Court.

The comments also demonstrate the numerous challenges of building a society and a law that respects and welcomes diversity. The comments made on the Court's institutional profile, an open platform, demonstrate the trivialization of freedom of expression, which is covered in hate speech, stimulating violent social practices, marked by prejudice and discrimination.

On the other hand, the Court's action in celebrating International LGBTi+ Pride Day socially reaffirms its commitment to combating LGBTphobia beyond judicial decisions, which have been valuable in building a more inclusive and egalitarian society. In addition, it demonstrates the importance and need for institutions to increasingly promote socio-educational actions aimed at various urgent issues in society, effectively contributing to social change.

REFERENCES

1. Bahia, A. G. M. F. de M., & Bomfim, R. (2022). Direito LGBTQ+ no Poder Judiciário. In *Dicionário Jurídico do Gênero e Sexualidade* (1st ed., pp. 379-386). Devires.
2. Balirano, G., & Borba, R. (2021). Redefinindo gênero, sexualidade e discurso na ascensão global do extremismo de direita. *Anglistica AION: Uma Revista Interdisciplinar*.
3. Carrara, S. (2010). Políticas e direitos sexuais no Brasil contemporâneo. *Bagoas-Estudos gays: gêneros e sexualidades*, 4(05).
4. Chagas, L. B. R., & Paula, L. T. de. (2023). Análise de discurso crítica como instrumental teórico e metodológico para a garantia semântica em linguagens documentárias. *Encontros Bibli*, 28, e90893. <https://doi.org/10.22456/1679-1251.90893>
5. Colares, V. (2014). Análise Crítica do Discurso Jurídico (ACDJ): o caso Genelva e a (im)procedência da mudança de nome. *ReVEL*, 12.
6. Deslandes, K. (2018). Homotransfobia e Direitos Sexuais: debates e embates contemporâneos. *Autêntica*.
7. Bonfim, M. A. L. do, et al. (2022). Branquitude e Racismo Antinegro no BBB 21: uma análise crítica do discurso da reprodução do pacto narcísico e da fragilidade branca. *Revista Ágora Filosófica*, 22(1), 176-197.
8. Facchini, R., & França, I. L. (Eds.). (2020). *Direitos em disputa: LGBTQ+, poder e diferença no Brasil contemporâneo*. Editora da Unicamp.
9. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Discurso e mudança social* (I. Magalhães, Trans.). Editora da Universidade de Brasília.
10. Gaspodini, I. B., & de Jesus, J. G. (2020). Heterocentrismo e ciscentrismo: crenças de superioridade sobre orientação sexual, sexo e gênero. *Revista Universo Psi*, 1(2), 33-51.
11. Lelis, R. C., & Almeida, F. L. de. (2019). *Diálogos LGBTQ+: avançando lutas e conjugando campos*. Devires.
12. Miguel, L. F. (2021). O mito da “ideologia de gênero” no discurso da extrema direita brasileira. *Cadernos Pagu*, e216216. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-1235/2021e216216>
13. Moreira, A. J. (2017). *Cidadania sexual: estratégia para ações inclusivas*. Arraes Editores.
14. Nascimento, L. (2021). *Transfeminismo*. Editora Jandaíra.
15. Pedra, C. B. (2020). *Direitos LGBTQ: a LGBTQfobia estrutural e a diversidade sexual e de gênero no direito brasileiro*. Editora Appris.
16. Quinalha, R. (2022). Repressão à Pessoas LGBTQ+. In *Dicionário Jurídico do Gênero e Sexualidade* (1st ed., pp. 611-615). Devires.
17. Rios, R. R. (2008). Desenvolver os direitos sexuais—desafios e tendências na América Latina. In *Questões de sexualidade: ensaios transculturais* (pp. 101-109). ABIA.
18. Van Dijk, T. A., Medeiros, B. W. L., & Andrade, M. L. C. V. O. (2013). Análise crítica do discurso multidisciplinar: um apelo em favor da diversidade. *Linha D'Água*, 26(2), 351-381.
19. Vitale, D., & Nagamine, R. (2018). *Gênero, direito e relações internacionais: debates de um campo em construção*. EDUFBA.