

# DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

## Chapter 1 : Totalitarianism - Wikipedia

*The Totalitarian Doctrine of 'Social Justice Warriors' Much of SJW's passion goes into speech and culture policing directed at victimless crimes that violate their moral taboos.*

Constitution which governs freedom of speech. That our legal system not only shields racists but allows farmbelt Fuhrers like Gary Lauck to export hate around the world like nuclear waste can be confusing to anti-fascists in other countries. This article will explain some of the workings of the First Amendment, show how racists manipulate freedom of speech to commit terrorism in the U. Understanding the First Amendment The United States has distinctive political principles and values that define its national identity. The First Amendment says that "Congress shall make no law Absolutists often quote Supreme Court jurist Oliver Wendell Holmes who declared that "the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market. Such interpretations are insufficiently conscious of the social reality of uneven power relationships between racists and their targets. Absolutists ignore the persistent inequality in the power of oppressed groups to communicate their ideas in the marketplace, just like Bill Gates can keep other companies from selling computer operating systems. In fact, the dominant group not only has the greater power to communicate their ideas, but they even have more credibility doing so. Inequities in racial power makes competition in the social marketplace purely hypothetical. There is no space not already occupied by the dominant white culture. Manipulating the First Amendment U. This leads to a legalistic distinction between acts that constitute racial terrorism and the words and ideas that motivate the attackers. In our country, acts " assault, battery, vandalism, arson, murder, lynchings, physical harassment " are punishable under our court system. But words " like nigger " or symbols " such as Nazi swastikas or burning crosses -- are protected by the courts as acts of individual expression. To protect the status quo of white domination, our legal justice system first formally excluded African Americans from equality, and it now stands passively aside while private actors do the dirty work of legitimating social inequality and silencing victims. A pertinent Supreme Court case was decided in after two race riots in Illinois in which more than one hundred men, women and children were killed, forcing another 6, African Americans to flee the state. In that case, *Beauharnais v. Illinois*, the head of the White Circle League distributed a leaflet declaring that African Americans would terrorize white neighborhoods with "rapes, robberies, knives, guns and marijuana. While it was certainly a victory for the anti-racist movement, this decision did not go far enough in banning the activities of racist individuals, largely because the government was not yet ready to outlaw its own racist policies. Board of Education school desegregation decision occurred two years later in On the other hand, the current Supreme Court is dominated by the right wing. Its interpretations disconnect racial terrorism from the harm inflicted on victims. In , the court decided in *R. Paul* that a cross burned in the front yard of an African American family by white teenagers was a form of protected symbolic speech. Using the artificial distinction between speech and action, the Court decided that the act of burning a cross to intimidate a black family was equivalent to freedom of speech. Fighting Human Wrongs with Human Rights Anti-racists must lead the way in ensuring that our social vision of justice again triumphs over the cruder vision of equality limited by white supremacy. The government has a constitutional obligation to eliminate obstacles that prevent equal participation in society. Racist speech, which not only silences its victims but denies them credibility in the eyes of the public at large, should be regulated. Courts have often recognized that the right of free speech is not absolute. They have limited free speech when it becomes libel, incites a riot, threatens an elected official, or conspires to monopolize industries. Bans on cigarette advertising or liquor sales also narrow free speech. Article 2 of this international human rights treaty requires that governments "prohibit and bring to an end, by all appropriate means The treaty not only protects the right of a black family to buy a home, but also protects all African Americans from discrimination so that they may live in the neighborhood of their choice. In this way, the treaty not only protects individual rights, but also collective rights as a members of a group. The

## **DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS**

anti-racist movement now must build a human rights movement in the United States that will force the repeal of this crippling reservation to the Race Convention. We can use international human rights standards to develop effective laws to halt the worldwide spread of the dangerous virus of racism. By bringing human rights home, contagious boxes of hate literature will no longer be shipped around the world with labels saying, "Made in America."

# DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

## Chapter 2 : No Free Speech For Aussie "Racists" | Winds of Jihad

*All white Australians are incorrigible racists who must be muzzled lest they "offend" or "insult" certain protected species. Right? Corruptocrats in the senate killed free speech, again. 18C, a law imposed on us by socialist subversives, remains unchanged.*

Since this photo was taken the store has closed. The Kleins now operate their bakery business out of their home. Sweet Cakes by Melissa Bake me a cake, or go to jail! Personally, I think both birth control and homosexuality are just fine, and gay marriage is as valid as straight marriage. But forcing everyone to act as if they think that way is just wrong. The list of people you must treat carefully keeps getting longer. Protected classes now include sex, race, age, disability, nationality, citizenship status, pregnancy, family status and more. You better treat me well! Why force someone who disapproves of your actions to bake you a cake? Lots of other bakers would love the business. This debate has moved from inclusion to demanding that everyone adopt your values. In a free country, bigots should have the right to be bigots. Americans should also have freedom of association. American lawyers talk about special protection for religious freedom, and in the Hobby Lobby case the Supreme Court said you could escape onerous parts of ObamaCare by paying lawyers a fortune and convincing judges that you are a closely held corporation with religious objections. But why must you be religious to practice what you believe? This should be about individual freedom. Of course, government must not discriminate. The worst of American racism and homophobia -- slavery, segregation enforced by Jim Crow laws, bans on interracial marriage, anti-sodomy laws, etc. That was wrong, and it was right for the federal government to intervene. But private actions are different. If I start a business with my own money, I ought to be allowed to serve only libertarians, people who wear blue shirts, whatever. My customers have choices. If I am racist or anti-gay, the free market will punish me. Enough people would boycott my business that I would probably lose money quickly. It would actually be useful to see which businesses refuse to serve one group or another. Tolerance is revealed by how people behave when they are free. American law fosters the illusion that everyone is unbiased, while their real feelings remain hidden, making them harder to boycott, shame or debate. Punishment from the market is enough. The heavy hand of law is not needed here. In the South, people banned from a lunch counter had few other choices. But today such coercion is no longer needed. Even in the difficult days of Reconstruction, after the Civil War, business began to bring together whites and blacks who might not always have liked each other but who wanted the best deals. It took several years for racists to get Jim Crow passed so they could put a stop to that erosion of the old racist ways. Government helped keep racism going for several more decades. Individuals should be allowed to discriminate. I discriminate all the time. I favor people over others when I choose my friends, jobs, hobbies, clubs, religion, etc. Elizabeth Taylor married nine times. Had she married again, should the EEOC have ordered her to marry someone from an ethnic minority? No one should ever force anyone to bake them a cake.

# DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

## Chapter 3 : Political positions of Noam Chomsky - Wikipedia

*Racism and First Amendment Center for Human Rights. Racists in the United States have always been able to cloak their ideas in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution which governs freedom of speech.*

He has described himself as a "fellow traveller" to the anarchist tradition , and refers to himself as a libertarian socialist , a political philosophy he summarizes as challenging all forms of authority and attempting to eliminate them if they are unjustified for which the burden of proof is solely upon those who attempt to exert power. He identifies with the labor-oriented anarcho-syndicalist current of anarchism in particular cases, and is a member of the Industrial Workers of the World. He also exhibits some favor for the libertarian socialist vision of participatory economics , [2] himself being a member of the Interim Committee for the International Organization for a Participatory Society. Chomsky is considered "one of the most influential left-wing critics of American foreign policy" by the Dictionary of Modern American Philosophers. He has stated that "with regard to freedom of speech there are basically two positions: He uses a definition of terrorism from a US army manual, which defines it as "the calculated use of violence or threat of violence to attain goals that are political, religious, or ideological in nature. This is done through intimidation, coercion, or instilling fear. Wanton killing of innocent civilians is terrorism, not a war against terrorism. One is the fact that terrorism works. So take the Nazis. They were protecting the local population from the terrorisms of the partisans. And like other resistance movements, there was terrorism. The Nazis were carrying out counter terror. In a debate on the legitimacy of political violence in , Chomsky argued that the "terror" of the Vietnam National Liberation Front Viet Cong was not justified, but that terror could in theory be justified under certain circumstances: I think we really have to ask questions of comparative costs, ugly as that may sound. And if we are going to take a moral position on thisâ€” and I think we shouldâ€”we have to ask both what the consequences were of using terror and not using terror. If it were true that the consequences of not using terror would be that the peasantry in Vietnam would continue to live in the state of the peasantry of the Philippines, then I think the use of terror would be justified. Chomsky gives reasons for directing his activist efforts to the state of which he is a citizen. He believes that his work can have more impact when directed at his own government, and that he holds a responsibility as a member of a particular country of origin to work to stop that country from committing crimes. He expresses this idea often with a comparison of other countries holding that every country has flexibility to address crimes by unfavored countries, but is always unwilling to deal with their own. Speaking in Nicaragua in , Chomsky was asked "We feel that through what you say and write you are our friend but at the same time you talk about North American imperialism and Russian imperialism in the same breath. I ask you how you can use the same arguments as reactionaries? From my personal experience there are two countries in which my political writings can basically not appear. One is the U. The other is the USSR. I think what we ought to do is to try to understand the truth about the world. And the truth about the world is usually quite unpleasant. My own concern is primarily the terror and violence carried out by my own state, for two reasons. For one thing, because it happens to be the larger component of international violence. But also for a much more important reason than that; namely, I can do something about it. So even if the U. And that is a simple ethical judgment. It is very easy to denounce the atrocities of someone else. That has about as much ethical value as denouncing atrocities that took place in the 18th century. The point is that the useful and significant political actions are those that have consequences for human beings. And those are overwhelmingly the actions which you have some way of influencing and controlling, which mean for me, American actions. But I am also involved in protesting Soviet imperialism, and also explaining its roots in Soviet society. And I think that anyone in the Third World would be making a grave error if they succumbed to illusions about these matters. One of the key things superpowers do, Chomsky argues, is try to organize the world according to the interests of their establishment, using military and economic means. Chomsky has repeatedly emphasized that the overall framework of US foreign policy

## DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

can be explained by the domestic dominance of US business interests and a drive to secure the state capitalist system. Those interests set the political agenda and the economic goals that aim primarily at US economic dominance. This, Chomsky says, has prompted the United States to repeatedly intervene to quell "independent development, regardless of ideology" in regions of the world where it has little economic or safety interests. In his book *Deterring Democracy* he argues that the conventional understanding of the Cold War as a confrontation of two superpowers is an "ideological construct. Those underlying motives can only be discovered by analyzing the domestic politics, especially the goals of the domestic elites in each country: Putting second order complexities to the side, for the USSR the Cold War has been primarily a war against its satellites, and for the U. For each, it has served to entrench a particular system of domestic privilege and coercion. The policies pursued within the Cold War framework have been unattractive to the general population, which accepts them only under duress. Throughout history, the standard device to mobilize a reluctant population has been the fear of an evil enemy, dedicated to its destruction. The superpower conflict served the purpose admirably, both for internal needs, as we see in the fevered rhetoric of top planning documents such as NSC 68 , and in public propaganda. The Cold War had a functional utility for the superpowers, one reason why it persisted. According to Chomsky, other Western democracies such as France and Canada are less liberal in their defense of controversial speech than the US. However, he does not credit the American government for these freedoms but rather mass social movements in the United States that fought for them. Chomsky is often sharply critical of other governments who suppress free speech , most controversially in the Faurisson affair but also of the suppression of free speech in Turkey. He notes that the US does have formal democratic structures, but they are dysfunctional. He argues that presidential elections are funded by concentrations of private power and orchestrated by the public relations industry, focusing discussion primarily on the qualities and the image of a candidate rather than on issues. If I had been in a swing state " this [Massachusetts] is a fixed state " if I had been in a swing state I probably would have held my nose and voted for Obama. Just to keep out the alternative, which is worse. In fact I wrote about him before the primaries. I thought he was awful. Chomsky argues that transnational corporate power is "developing its own governing institutions" reflective of their global reach. IMF aid and loans are normally contingent upon such reforms. Additionally, this means that corporations can threaten to relocate to poorer countries, and Chomsky sees this as a powerful weapon to keep workers in richer countries in line. Chomsky takes issue with the terms used in discourse on globalization, beginning with the term "globalization" itself, which he maintains refers to a corporate-sponsored economic integration rather than being a general term for things becoming international. He dislikes the term anti-globalization being used to describe what he regards as a movement for globalization of social and environmental justice. Chomsky understands what is popularly called " free trade " as a "mixture of liberalization and protection designed by the principal architects of policy in the service of their interests, which happen to be whatever they are in any particular period. He has also defined Soviet communism as "fake socialism", particularly because any socialism worthy of the name requires authentic democratic control of production and resources as well as public ownership. He has said that contrary to what many in America claim, the collapse of the Soviet Union should be regarded as "a small victory for socialism", not capitalism. In a speech given in Hanoi on April 13, , and broadcast by Radio Hanoi the next day, Chomsky spoke of his "admiration for the people of Vietnam who have been able to defend themselves against the ferocious attack, and at the same time take great strides forward toward the socialist society. People will be free to do as they like, and the work they voluntarily choose will be both "rewarding in itself" and "socially useful. Work that was fundamentally distasteful to all, if any existed, would be distributed equally among everyone. There are many things to object to in any society. But take China, modern China; one also finds many things that are really quite admirable. But I do think that China is an important example of a new society in which very interesting positive things happened at the local level, in which a good deal of the collectivization and communization was really based on mass participation and took place after a level of understanding had been reached in the peasantry that led to this next step.

# DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

## Chapter 4 : Killing Free Speech

*Why does the ACLU defend free speech for unpopular groups such as Nazis, Ku Klux Klan (KKK) members, and others who advocate racist or totalitarian doctrines?*

Student protests swept across campuses with demands often focused on purging thoughtcrime—leading to heated debates on whether this movement is a dangerous pseudo-progressive authoritarianism or a long-overdue effort to achieve justice for all. His Exhibit A, the legalization of same-sex marriage, actually had very little to do with the current social justice movement; it was the result of two decades of very different, pragmatic activism that focused on a clear goal—the legal right to marry—and stressed equality, not gay identity. Most Americans support gender equality, believe transgender people should be able to live as they wish, and reject anti-Muslim hate. But social justice warriors have turned these causes into malignant self-parody. Most Americans support gender equality, believe transgender people should be able to live as they wish and reject anti-Muslim hate. Their anti-Islamophobia trashes feminist critics of conservative Islamism and victim-blames journalists murdered for publishing Mohammed cartoons. Have the social justice warriors of supported some worthy causes? But much of their passion goes into speech and culture policing directed at victimless crimes that violate their moral taboos. Because SocJus is so focused on changing bad attitudes and ferreting out subtle biases and insensitivities, its hostility to free speech and thought is not an unfortunate byproduct of the movement but its very essence. In an email replying to a student who had written to her about racial issues on campus, Ms. Nor is any other group so preoccupied with linguistic cleansing. SocJus speech- and thought-policing includes self-policing. But, as atheist blogger Rebecca Bradley has argued, the movement also has many elements of an apocalyptic religious cult that sees the world as mired in sin and evil except for a handful of the elect. I start believing that everyone is pro-choice, open-minded, have moral compass—care about sexism, racism, body shaming, etc, but then I walk out my front door and realize that everyone is still just as moronic as they were two years ago. There is a word for ideologies, religious or secular, that seek to politicize and control every aspect of human life: Unlike most such ideologies, SocJus has no fixed doctrine or clear utopian vision. But in a way, its amorphousness makes it more tyrannical. While all revolutions are prone to devouring their children, the SocJus movement may be especially vulnerable to self-immolation: Your cool feminist T-shirt can become a racist atrocity in a mouse click. Intersectionality also makes SocJus uniquely vulnerable to internal conflicts and tensions. The influence of SocJus has spread beyond academia and activist circles. It also sets the tone for much of the online media. But its unchecked ascendancy may be over. If was the year of the Social Justice Warrior, could be the year of the anti-authoritarian rebellion. Read these related posts:

# DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

## Chapter 5 : Free Speech on Trial in the Netherlands - Again

*They stifle free speech and instill fear to the point that ideas that do not coincide with the government's are met with suppression and force and eventually the midnight knock on the door. They stifle free speech and instill fear to the point that ideas that do not coincide with the government's are met with suppression and force and.*

Is integralism essentially bound up with racism, nationalism, and totalitarianism? When those in whose charge the common good lies do not order it explicitly to God, is society not corrupted at its very root? Political prudence rules the common good insofar as the latter is Divine. For that reason Cajetan and John of St. Thomas held that the legal justice of the prince is more perfect than the virtue of religion. The ordering to the common good is so natural that a pure intellect cannot deviate from it in the pure state of nature. In fact the fallen angels, elevated to the supernatural order, did turn aside from the common good but from that common good which is the most Divine, namely supernatural beatitude, and it is only by way of consequence that they lost their natural common good. The fallen angels ignored by a practical ignorance *ignorantia electionis* the common good of grace; we, on the other hand, have come to the point of being ignorant of every common good even speculatively. The common good, and not the person and liberty, being the very principle of all law, of all rights, of all justice and of all liberty, a speculative error concerning it leads fatally to the most execrable practical consequences. Neither article identifies integralism with the ideologies of racism, nationalism, and totalitarianism. That is only fitting. At the same time, however, it is incumbent upon those who embrace a refreshed and authentic Catholic integralism to distance themselves from non-Christian movements, past and present, which tended to view religion through an instrumentalist lens. Whether these movements worshipped blood, soil, or both is irrelevant; that they did not place our Lord Jesus Christ at the center of their respective programs renders them poor representatives of truly Catholic integralism. It is the error contained in those ideas which do not hesitate to divorce civil authority from every kind of dependence upon the Supreme Being. Once the authority of God and the sway of His law are denied in this way, the civil authority as an inevitable result tends to attribute to itself that absolute autonomy which belongs exclusively to the Supreme Maker. It puts itself in the place of the Almighty and elevates the State or group into the last end of life, the supreme criterion of the moral and juridical order, and therefore forbids every appeal to the principles of natural reason and of the Christian conscience. Nonetheless, one must not forget the essential insufficiency and weakness of every principle of social life which rests upon a purely human foundation, is inspired by merely earthly motives and relies for its force on the sanction of a purely external authority. Where the dependence of human right upon the Divine is denied, where appeal is made only to some insecure idea of a merely human authority, and an autonomy is claimed which rests only upon a utilitarian morality, there human law itself justly forfeits in its more weighty application the moral force which is the essential condition for its acknowledgment and also for its demand of sacrifices. Further, in an era where almost all Western countries are comprised of different ethnic groups, it is particularly important to remain vigilant against conflating national interests with racist intents. A Catholic integralist may perhaps rightly lament poorly crafted immigration policies which, among other things, indiscriminately allow the importation of religious and intellectual error into his country; but he should in no way lose the desire to serve as a witness to the truth and lead his newfound fellow countrymen to the true religion, which is the Catholic Faith. Love of country is, to a measured extent, part of integralism insofar as it desires the concrete political community to be oriented to the common good. It is a lie to say that integralists wish simply to swap out one form of ideologically driven oppression for another. To embrace any other conception of liberty would run the risk of rejecting the objective moral order of the world altogether while continuing to support liberalism—an ideology no less destructive than the others rejected here.

## DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

### Chapter 6 : The Emerging Police State : William M. Kunstler :

*Free speech is regarded as being inimical to fascism, and rightly so. And leftists routinely claim that they are the enemies of fascism and the champions of free speech. But as we see over and over again of late, it is the radical left which is most in bed with fascism, regularly preventing freedom.*

Only conservatives care about free speech anymore. A look at how the politics of free speech have flipped. But pregnancy advice is not merely medical; it is also ethical, religious, political, psychiatric, and deeply personal. Such advice which, coming from a Christian organization, might include strong pleas not to get an abortion does not necessarily constitute medical advice at all. The majority, in their wisdom, agreed with me. The two decisions were the latest in a stunning run of victories for a conservative agenda that has increasingly been built on the foundation of free speech. Conservative groups, borrowing and building on arguments developed by liberals, have used the First Amendment to justify unlimited campaign spending, discrimination against gay couples and attacks on the regulation of tobacco, pharmaceuticals and guns. As absurd as it sounds, the Times article really does advance the view that, since those conservative victories are rooted in free speech, there must be something wrong with free speech itself. That used to be an uncontroversial and nonideological point. But that seems to be changing. The interesting thing about the Times article is that it says that the Republicans, or conservatives, are making free speech into a controversial issue. Free speech always was ideological; it is part of the American civil religion. The Times article continues to argue that: And an increasingly conservative judiciary has been more than a little receptive to this [libertarian] argument. That is a sharp break from earlier eras. Ironically, the next thing the Times says is that it is thinkers on the left who have, strikingly, changed their minds about free speech: Take pornography and street protests. Liberals were once largely united in fighting to protect sexually explicit materials from government censorship. In , many liberals supported the right of the American Nazi Party to march among Holocaust survivors in Skokie, Ill. Far fewer supported the free-speech rights of the white nationalists who marched last year in Charlottesville , Va. This traditional support of free speech, by the way, has been perhaps the single strongest point of agreement between libertarianism in particular and progressivism. But apparently no longer. The question, then, is why the left ever believed otherwise. After all, plainly, many free speech rules and policies were implemented. Just as plainly, generations of the most brilliant legal minds were free speech absolutists. It was, and remains, the Constitutional policy of the nation, as evidenced by the fact that the Supremes unanimously rejected hate speech laws again last year. It seems that Prof. The article next introduces some just shoddy academic theorizing, in an attempt to justify speech control and censorship: Some liberals now say that free speech disproportionately protects the powerful and the status quo. The notion that people who attack American traditions of free speech and First Amendment are liberal, of all things, is patently absurd. If you are skeptical of free speech absolutism, then you are not a liberal for that reason alone: Welcome to Planet Earth: The obvious fact that the powerful enjoy free speech rights, however, does not establish that free speech is not also a deeply important right of those who are weak. It is, after all, the rights of minorities and of the disempowered that most need protection by the law, considering that the powerful can usually take care of themselves. They all, with the sole exception of Citizens United, feature the rights of the ordinary, weak citizen protected from the depredations of some of the most powerful governments on earth. Nazis and Klansmen are surely some of the most hated and disempowered people in the country at present and pay for that ; like it or not, equality before the law means they have the same speech rights as more decent people. Well, to be sure, pornographers can be powerful, but only a very few of them. Most of those who produce and consume porn are not particularly rich or powerful. The free speech rights of the rich and powerful are, by contrast, well protected. In the great First Amendment cases in the middle of the 20th century, few conservatives spoke up for the protection of political dissenters, including communists and civil rights leaders, comedians using vulgar language on the airwaves, or artists exploring sexuality in novels and on film. In ,

## DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

Robert H. Bork, then a prominent conservative law professor and later a federal judge and Supreme Court nominee, wrote that the First Amendment should be interpreted narrowly in a law-review article that remains one of the most-cited of all time. His principle, that the First Amendment protects only political speech and not creative works, was repressive, and roundly despised, particularly by progressives and liberals. Bork was the sort of jurist only an arch-conservative could love. So it is amazing that a Times reporter would have the temerity to mention Bork in the context of this article, considering just how loathed he was by the liberals of yesteryear. That much, I would have thought, is obvious. Yet the Times writer seems not to think so, and in this he follows Seidman, who it seems confuses partisanship for scholarship. This could be due to the random patterns in the data. It would be hard to show otherwise: It could also be because conservative speech has come under attack. Our journalist draws the inference anyway: The Court, led by Chief Justice Earl Warren from 1953 to 1969, was almost exclusively concerned with cases concerning liberal speech. Of its 60 free-expression cases, only five, or about 8 percent, challenged the suppression of conservative speech. The proportion of challenges to restrictions on conservative speech has steadily increased. Burger from 1969 to 1981; to 42 percent in the court led by Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist from 1981 to 1993; and to 65 percent in the Roberts court. Even putting aside my earlier points, this argument is bizarre. Cases protecting conservative speech have risen, from until today, from 22 percent, to 42 percent, to 65 percent today. Consider that in 1953, the number was 22 percent. Would it have been reasonable, at that time, to conclude that conservatives should not have cared at all about free speech rights, that they were justified in being soft on free speech? Yet for all of the bad argumentation that is present within the Times article, the Supremes themselves articulate their positions well. No one, we trust, would seriously argue that the First Amendment permits this. Our world has changed. So, I fully expect there to be growing calls for laws against hate speech in the United States. Support on the American left for such laws is already huge. The number goes up to 61 percent of Democrats, if we specify that the laws protect black Americans against hate speech. Free speech on campus has increasingly come under attack. This is almost as stunning is the fact that 48 percent of all Americans support such a totalitarian system as well. The next presidents might very well include socialists who would replace Ginsberg, Breyer, Thomas, and Alito with radical free speech skeptics. Besides, not everything depends on the Court. Formerly mainstream Democrats are showing themselves to be increasingly willing to take extreme action. Due to its central role in protecting popular sovereignty in a republic, free speech is as important as it gets. The fact that the left is repudiating its former free speech absolutism is much more important than its decision to push for gay marriage or any other social agenda. Free speech skepticism—openness to censorship—could easily become de rigueur on the left, as gay marriage rights have become. That is actually what I would expect, because if there is one thing that animates progressives today, it is their contempt, even utter hatred, for anything they perceive as racist, sexist, homophobic, or anti-immigrant. To make matters worse, progressive judgment about what is bigoted in these ways is often inaccurate. Well, if you support free speech, push back as effectively as you can when you see your friends and acquaintances moving in the direction of free speech skepticism. This is still a battle for hearts and minds. The Supreme Court frequently follows popular opinion, and, sadly, there is no reason to think that a future Court might not dismantle many current First Amendment protections. Also, learn the arguments; the case for free speech is very strong. There is no intellectually respectable case to be made for censorship especially of merely offensive speech. By contrast, the risks of censorship and compelled speech are enormous: Follow him on Twitter Isanger If you liked this article please consider becoming a patron of Quillette Share this:

## DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

### Chapter 7 : Defining Anti-Semitism, Threatening Free Speech - calendrierdelascience.com Original

*Speech On Racism. talk to you about an extremely serious issue that faces society today, calendrierdelascience.com is the discrimination of a person because of the race that they have inherited.*

Emphasis should be directed at avoidance of any link or association of Islam with terrorism or the use of Islamophobic rhetoric. Mainstream journalists do not appear to find it dangerous that their freedom of speech should be supervised by the OIC, while Western governments, far from offering any resistance, appear, perhaps for votes, to be cozily going along with everything. It describes itself as: The Organization is the collective voice of the Muslim world. It was emphasized that Muslims and Western societies would have to address the issue with a sense of commitment to ending Islamophobia. Islamophobia poses a threat not only to Muslims but to the world at large. The OIC was concrete in its demands to the West. Today, many Western European governments are prosecuting their own citizens for criticizing Islam or Muslims in, for example, Sweden, Germany and the UK, although it is unclear, whether or how much of this development can be directly attributed to the OIC. In Sweden, for instance, pensioners especially have been prosecuted for making critical comments about Islam on Facebook. A year-old woman referred to so-called unaccompanied minors as "bearded children" and said -- not inaccurately here and here and here -- that some seem to be "engaged in rape and demolishing their [asylum] homes". In February, a Swedish court sentenced her to a fine for "incitement of hatred against an ethnic group". In addition to cultivating high-level contacts with Western actors, the OIC also is pursuing a comprehensive media strategy, agreed upon in Saudi Arabia in December and focused on the West. This OIC media strategy claims as one of its goals: Finally, the OIC media strategy calls for fostering a "network of high profile western public figures supporting efforts to combat Islamophobia in politics, journalism and civil society" as well as teams of scholars, academics, and celebrities, who will be the faces of the campaign. Television and advertising campaigns "targeting public transport bus and metro, famous newspapers and magazines for each country two times in one year". Arranging three talk shows per year in key TV channels in US and Europe about Islam with the participation of selected members from Muslim countries. Visits to schools and universities by OIC "specialist teams". Hosting "Western activists" from various fields in selected Muslim countries where they "can interact with intellectuals, politicians, media figures, and religious scholars". The OIC promises that it will also create a fund to support local anti-Islamophobia initiatives, and monitor media and place commentary and news stories in key Western publications. It is important to note that in the years, the OIC sought to advance an agenda in the UN, banning "the defamation of religions", but the OIC gave up on the ban after realizing that there was not sufficient support there for the proposal. The idea is not merely to ban gratuitous ridicule -- which, by the way, sensible people realize government should not do and, under our Constitution, may not do even if they themselves are repulsed by gratuitous ridicule. The objective is to ban all critical examination of Islam, period. Mainstream Western journalists do not appear to find it dangerous that their freedom of speech should be supervised by the OIC, while Western governments, far from offering any resistance, appear, perhaps for votes, to be cozily going along with everything. Judith Bergman is a columnist, lawyer and political analyst.

## DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

### Chapter 8 : The Totalitarian Doctrine of "Social Justice Warriors" | Observer

*The Post's pieces suffer from dubious, superficial understandings of free speech, and attack the left while whitewashing the far right.*

Tim Scott and has four co-sponsors: The House sponsor of H. Peter Roskam, with 41 cosponsors, 30 Republicans and 11 Democrats. Both bills remain in committee. The Senate passed a similar bill two years ago, but it never reached the House floor. Right off the bat, the legislation seems odd: While the act is directed at education, the resulting law would reach beyond that realm because it would officially stigmatize as anti-Semitic any speech and activity, public and private, said to fall within the definition. Since this would at least chill the open marketplace of ideas, advocates of free speech should be concerned about the content of the definition and its revealing support material. We must not assume that merely because the definition is said to brand something anti-Semitic that it is actually anti-Semitic. Hence, those departments have managed to shoehorn religion into a statute that does not mention religion. And here the problems continue. Writing in the Guardian, Feldman, says of the 11 examples: Some of the points are sensible, some are not. That should be of concern. Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, the state of Israel, or even for acts committed by non-Jews. Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, and denying Israel the right to exist. Two things are worth pointing out here. I am unaware of criticism of the Fact Sheet or legislation for this key modification. In another survey, Muslims ranked below atheists. For Americans 30 years and up, Jews rank at or near the top, and the score has risen since One suspects the atmosphere on campus is more hostile to Arab and Muslim professors and students than to Jews. See examples here and here. And we cannot discount the likelihood that criticism of Israel is simply interpreted as criticism of Jews qua Jews. There are thousands of campuses in the United States, and in very few is antisemitism " or anti-Israel animus " an issue. It is so disreputable that people have shied away from criticizing Israel for fear of being accused of Jew-hatred, which can destroy careers and friendships. This is rank collectivism that no liberal individualist will accept. We must note the irony, however, that many Jews themselves believe that all Jews without exception constitute a genetic entity, though this is patently absurd. Jews are of many races, ethnicities, nationalities, and cultures and until a couple of hundred years into the Common Era, Judaism was a proselytizing religion with many successes at converting whole kingdoms, nations, and tribes. In other words, many Jews today are descendants of people who converted to Judaism, sometimes unwillingly, and who never were in the Land of Israel. In other words, the government of Israel claims to speak for all Jews, which is an affront to any Jew who does not wish to be spoken for by a foreign government or who no longer regards himself as a Jew. If the Jewish people are not a racial or ethnic entity but a diverse religious group, one can, like Spinoza, stop being a Jew. And this claim, which predates the Nation-State Law, is what has given rise to the dual loyalty suspicion. But what about denying the Jewish people the right to self-determination on land taken from its rightful owners, as Jewish and non-Jewish anti-Zionists have long denied? And when will Congress get around to condemning those who deny the right of Palestinians to self-determination? If any national group treated another group the way the Zionists and Israelis have treated the Palestinians, they would have been condemned by liberal-minded Jewish Americans along with most other Americans. Second, where is the double standard in the criticism of Israel? Do the oppressed never become oppressors? The fact is that Jews have repeatedly made that comparison, for example, the late Hajo Meyer, a Holocaust survivor, and Yair Golan, the former deputy chief of the general staff of the Israel Defense Force. It was formed out of the membership and following of the former Irgun Zvai Leumi, a terrorist, right-wing, chauvinist organization in Palestine. Yet one more question: Or perhaps only men and women with Jewish mothers are to be permitted to do what is forbidden to others. That would be odd view indeed. No, the Israeli regime does not operate death camps, but it does things that resemble what the Nazi and other totalitarian regimes did to Jews and other groups. Gaza, where the more-than-decade-old Israeli

## DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

blockade causes two million Palestinians, half of them children, to be undernourished and forced to drink polluted water, has been called a concentration camp and a ghetto by Jews. Real anti-Semitism is ugly and execrable. I would be suspicious of anyone who was eager to pack my bags and shuffle me off to Tel Aviv. There simply are no reasonable grounds for a presumption of anti-Semitism about opponents of Israel, certainly not in people of good faith. Real or imagined anti-Semitism can be useful in deterring Jewish assimilation and disillusionment with Israel. Free speech and inquiry must be protected. As the ACLU said about the legislation: The overbroad definition of anti-Semitism in this bill risks incorrectly equating constitutionally protected criticism of Israel with anti-Semitism, making it likely that free speech will be chilled on campuses. As a result, the proposed legislation is likely to chill the speech of students, faculty, and other members campus communities around the country, and is unnecessary to enforce federal prohibitions on harassment in education as such protections already exist under federal law. It is an unnecessary law which will hurt Jewish students and the academy. It was never intended as a vehicle to monitor or suppress speech on campus. In testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, Stern elaborated: The proponents of the legislation have made a business model of seeking out speech they believe transgresses the Department of State Definition. Armed with a congressional determination that effectively says campus anti-Zionism is antisemitism, professors will correctly see themselves at risk when they ask their students to read and digest materials deemed anti-Zionist, whether the writings of leading 20th century Jewish thinkers who were skeptical of Zionism, such as Hannah Arendt and Martin Buber, or of contemporary Palestinians. Professors do not get combat pay. It will be safer and wiser for them to teach about Jews in the shtetl than Jews in modern Israel, and Zionism as a concept from the late 19th century, rather than how it plays out today. The academy, Jewish students, and faculty teaching about Jewish issues, will all suffer. As it is, American politicians are afraid to defend the Palestinians against Israel or to question the huge annual military appropriation that enables the brutality; candidates have much to lose both in campaign contributions and reputation. Those who slip, like Bernie Sanders , Cory Booker , and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez , will have hell to pay and will likely be more careful in the future. Sanders has had his ups as well as downs. Lerman also shows, as already noted, that by its own word choices, the IHRA suggests that its illustrations may or may not qualify as examples of anti-Semitism depending on the context. Lerman notes that defenders of the definition make opposing claims “ that the examples both are and are not part of the definition ” depending on which position is convenient at the time. Clearly, the Labor Party leadership stands accused of anti-Semitism purely for adopting a code of conduct that distinguishes anti-Semitism from criticism of Israel. Is this sort of smear campaign that is in store for members of Congress who vote against the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act? Sheldon Richman is the executive editor of The Libertarian Institute , senior fellow and chair of the trustees of the Center for a Stateless Society , and a contributing editor at Antiwar. Read more by Sheldon Richman.

## DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

### Chapter 9 : Thousands march in 'free speech' protest led by rightwing figures | World news | The Guardian

*The worst of American racism and homophobia -- slavery, segregation enforced by Jim Crow laws, bans on interracial marriage, anti-sodomy laws, etc. -- was government-enforced discrimination.*

Dutch Freedom of speech is the ultimate liberal value -- and it is the first value that people who wish to control us would take away. If a court in a Western society decides to censor or punish Geert Wilders or others for non-violent speech, the court not only attacks the very humanistic values and liberal society we claim to hold dear; it brings us a step closer to totalitarianism. Even the idea of having an "acceptable" range of views is inherently totalitarian. But what does one do if immigrants prefer not to assimilate? Europeans may be faced with a painful choice: What do they want more, the humanistic values of individual freedom or an Islamized Europe? Censorship is not a path we should wish to take. While we may rightly fear those on the political right, we would do well to fear even more the autocratic thought-police and censorship on the political left. You are not truly a proponent of free speech unless you defend speech you dislike as fervently as speech you like. Dutch prosecutors have charged Wilders with insulting deliberately a group of people because of their race and inciting hatred. In another instance, Wilders is reported to have stated that The Hague should be "a city with fewer burdens and if possible fewer Moroccans. Geert Wilders during his March speech, where he asked "Do you want more or fewer Moroccans? His remarks do not suggest that people attack Moroccans or that people should hate Moroccans; they simply suggest that there should be lower levels of immigration from Morocco. A line is dangerous to draw: Is it also possible that because Wilders is labelled as politically "far right," people on the political "left," instead of proposing counterarguments, would like to shut him up by branding him a "racist"? Here are several more statements, none from Wilders; no one who said them has been prosecuted: One can see that these statements by politicians of the Labour Party, which is one of the current governing parties of the Netherlands, are more inciting, condemnable statements against Moroccans than anything Wilders has said. Yet no prosecution has been initiated against these individuals. Would it not be better to discuss a nuanced immigration policy openly, like adults, and thereby eliminate prejudice through rational argument? Prosecuting Wilders has only emboldened the anti-immigrationists, making them less responsive to reason and discussion. Ironically, this trial has moved many left-liberals, who might be criticizing his views, instead to defend his fundamental rights. On limiting immigration in general, some critics consider that calling for a moratorium on immigration is illiberal -- often other groups such as Christians and Yazidis might be fleeing from ISIS or other extremist Islamic organizations. Basing immigration on nationality might also bring back memories of Nazi Germany, when restrictions often were based on crude religious, ethnic and national caricatures. Other critics seem uncomfortable with calls for the dominance of "Christian, Jewish and humanist traditions" within Dutch culture. How, they ask, can one effectively police a "culture" without seemingly authoritarian restrictions on those who might not fit into it? Still other critics argue that prohibiting the construction of new mosques restricts religious freedom, and could cause further tension with members of the Islamic community, instead of working with them to solve their conflicts with the West. That, for example, is not an anti-immigration argument; it is a legitimate question that needs to be answered. There are also many questions that pertain to what a society might look like if there is a tectonic demographic shift, along with a tectonic shift in culture that might accompany it. As one commentator explained, if you have an apple pie with a few cranberries, it is still an apple pie; but if you keep adding more and more cranberries, at some point it is no longer an apple pie, it is a cranberry pie. That is what the Aztecs faced when the Spaniards arrived in South America. That is what Christianity faced in Turkey when the Muslim Turks arrived. Today, in much of the Middle East, Judaism and Christianity have virtually ceased to exist. Hard as it might be to contemplate, Europeans might at some point be faced with a painful choice: Which do they want more, the humanistic values of individual freedom or an Islamized Europe? Whether or not one agrees, especially with the tone, this is the dilemma Wilders has chosen to face -- before a

## DOWNLOAD PDF CONCERNING FREE SPEECH FOR RACISTS AND TOTALITARIANS

transformation becomes so fundamental that it cannot be reversed. Although he has come down on the side of liberal values, this is seen by critics as violating other liberal values, such as not to judge one culture superior to another. But what should one tolerate, if the other culture advocates stoning women to death for adultery? Or, without four male witnesses attesting to the contrary, regarding rape as adultery? Or executing people for having a different sexual preference, or religion, or for leaving the religion? Or officially regarding women as worth half a man? Is it a humanistic, liberal value to stay silent -- to condemn at least half the population to that? But that is their culture! Is it humanistic say "but that is their culture"? These are values over which wars have been fought. If we fail to do that, what we end up with is an authoritarian state in which government agencies decide which views are acceptable and which are not. We have lived through that before with the Soviet Union, and we are now living through it again with countries such as Saudi Arabia, Russia, China, Pakistan and Iran. A happy picture, they are not. Who decides on the deciders? It is the "unacceptable" thoughts that do. The reason the right to freedom of speech exists is to protect the minority from the majority -- so we can openly, freely exchange opinions and have discussions. If we wish to have any kind of democracy in more than just name, people need to be able openly to challenge ideas that are considered unquestionable, even sacred, as well as people who are considered sacred. Only open discussion can have a beneficial influence by highlighting problems and shaping policy. In discussing even outlandish views, we are reaffirming our right to say them, justifying why liberal values of freedom are paramount. Freedom of speech is the ultimate liberal value -- and it is the first freedom that people who wish to control us would take away. As the historian Clare Spark wrote, "Most of European history, with the exception of England, repressed speech that was anti-authoritarian. One might think of Plato, the Spanish Inquisition, and the career of Spinoza for just a few examples. When you defend the fundamental right of another to express his view, it does not mean that you agree with the view. It does not mean that you would refrain from attacking that view if it seemed based on flawed premises -- or even if it did not. Freedom of speech means opposing someone with counterarguments, not trying to silence him. It is restrictions on free speech that are producing many of the worst mockeries of justice today, in countries such as China, North Korea, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Russia, and Iran. Repressing speech only dangerously hinders the liberal cause. Groups that, in an authoritarian manner, call for censorship and the suppression of debate are being allowed to thrive. We are seeing this now in America on campuses and in the authoritarian attempts to prevent voters from hearing presidential candidates by disrupting speeches. When one fails to answer difficult questions or tries to silence their proponents, instead of solving the problem of prejudice, you are in reality feeding their prejudices and allowing them to grow unchallenged. We urgently need to be concerned about laws that would make "being insulted," a criminal offense. Where does an "insult" start or stop? In addition, people who claim to be offended might just be using the law to try to silence others with whom they disagree. Finally, criminalizing views such as those of Wilders does not extinguish them. Yes, people might feel intimidated from raising ideas for fear of reprisals, but the suppressed ideas will continue to fester, often with an even stronger force. It is completely understandable why many are not quick to come to the aid of Wilders because they deem him an opponent. However, if there is one rallying call to those who are in doubt of whether to support Wilders, it is this: We may not like that we have to defend people we may even regard as racists or xenophobes, but if we do not defend the rights of all, then who will be next among us to have his rights eroded? Wilders should not be standing trial for what he has said. Could there be a question of the case against Wilders being political? It sure looks like that. Robbie Travers, a political commentator and consultant, is Executive Director of Agora, former media manager at the Human Security Centre, and a law student at the University of Edinburgh. The articles printed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editors or of Gatestone Institute. No part of the Gatestone website or any of its contents may be reproduced, copied or modified, without the prior written consent of Gatestone Institute. Get Free Exclusive Gatestone Content: