

# Contents

*Acknowledgements*

xiv

## 1 Introduction 1

1.1 Introduction 1

1.2 Hate speech and politics 7

1.2.1 Politically motivated hate speech 7

1.2.2 The use of the term 'hate speech' as a political or politicised act 8

1.2.3 Political disputes concerning what to do about hate speech 9

1.3 So what is the real problem of hate speech? 11

1.3.1 Understanding what the concept hate speech reveals about power 11

1.3.2 The real problem of hate speech is not simply in calling it 'a problem' 12

1.3.3 So what that people disagree about what to count as hate speech? 14

1.3.4 Defining the legal concept hate speech, whilst not forgetting context 17

1.3.5 Acknowledging the real harms of hate speech, in spite of the politics 18

1.4 Hate speech as a multisite problem 19

1.4.1 Hate speech as an individual, group and societal problem 19

1.4.2 Hate speech as a technological problem 21

1.4.3 Hate speech as a legal problem 23

1.4.4 Hate speech as a problem of, and not simply for, political figures 24

1.4.5 Hate speech as an international problem 28

1.5 Preliminaries 31

1.5.1 Methodological framework 31

1.5.2 The canon 35

1.5.3 The wider field of academic literature 37

1.5.4 Chapter summaries 40

PART I

<b>The political context of hate speech laws</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>2 The contextualised meaning and salience of problems of hate speech</b>	<b>47</b>
2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	47
2.2 <i>Nigeria</i>	49
2.3 <i>Kenya</i>	51
2.4 <i>South Africa</i>	54
2.5 <i>India</i>	60
2.6 <i>China</i>	63
2.7 <i>US</i>	67
2.8 <i>Japan</i>	72
2.9 <i>UK</i>	75
2.10 <i>Turkey</i>	79
2.11 <i>Germany</i>	81
2.12 <i>Hungary</i>	85
2.13 <i>Italy</i>	89
2.14 <i>Conclusion</i>	93
<b>3 The politics behind the introduction of stirring up religious hatred offences in England and Wales</b>	<b>101</b>
3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	101
3.2 <i>The public order explanation</i>	104
3.2.1 <i>Post-war immigration</i>	104
3.2.2 <i>An evolving public policy response to an evolving social problem</i>	105
3.3 <i>The sop explanation</i>	106
3.3.1 <i>A sop for what?</i>	107
3.3.2 <i>Why has the sop explanation persisted in the face of contrary evidence?</i>	108
3.4 <i>The anti-terrorism explanation</i>	109
3.4.1 <i>Is the legislative vehicle coincidental?</i>	109
3.4.2 <i>Problems with the anti-terrorism explanation</i>	112
3.5 <i>The client politics explanation</i>	115
3.5.1 <i>What the burdens on Muslims can and cannot tell us</i>	116
3.5.2 <i>That Muslims were one group among many who were burdened</i>	119
3.6 <i>The parity of protection explanation</i>	119
3.6.1 <i>The wider policy background</i>	120
3.6.2 <i>Ironing out potential kinks in the parity of protection explanation</i>	122
3.7 <i>A pluralistic explanation</i>	124
3.8 <i>Conclusion</i>	124

<b>4</b>	<b>International relations theory and international hate speech instruments</b>	<b>131</b>
4.1	<i>Introduction</i>	131
4.2	<i>The existing body of international hate speech instruments</i>	134
4.2.1	<i>UN system</i>	134
4.2.2	<i>Africa</i>	135
4.2.3	<i>Americas</i>	135
4.2.4	<i>Asia</i>	136
4.2.5	<i>Europe</i>	136
4.2.6	<i>Analysis</i>	136
4.3	<i>International relations theory and the ICERD</i>	139
4.3.1	<i>The ICERD</i>	139
4.3.2	<i>Monitoring reports and complaints procedures under the ICERD</i>	141
4.3.3	<i>Realism</i>	145
4.3.4	<i>Institutionalism</i>	149
4.3.5	<i>Constructivism</i>	154
4.3.6	<i>Critical approaches</i>	158
4.3.7	<i>What, together, these approaches tell us about the international politics of the ICERD</i>	162
4.4	<i>US foreign policy and the ICCPR</i>	163
4.4.1	<i>The Cold War</i>	164
4.4.2	<i>The shining city on the hill</i>	167
4.4.3	<i>The new world order</i>	169
4.4.4	<i>Smart power</i>	171
4.4.5	<i>Disruptive diplomacy</i>	174
4.4.6	<i>A story of American exceptionalism?</i>	182
4.4.7	<i>What does the future hold for the US and international hate speech instruments?</i>	185
4.5	<i>Diplomatic criticism</i>	190
4.5.1	<i>What makes diplomatic criticism special, descriptively speaking?</i>	190
4.5.2	<i>The moral obligation to support just international norms</i>	192
4.5.3	<i>The problem of norm contestation</i>	194
4.5.4	<i>The problem of counter-accusations of hypocrisy</i>	196
4.5.5	<i>The problem of counter-accusations of postcolonialism and neocolonialism</i>	201
4.6	<i>Conclusion</i>	204
<b>PART II</b>		
	<b>Political arguments against hate speech laws</b>	<b>217</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>The slippery slope argument</b>	<b>219</b>
5.1	<i>Introduction</i>	219

5.2	<i>The contours of the slippery slope argument</i>	221
5.3	<i>The facing the facts response</i>	223
5.3.1	<i>Societies with authoritarian regimes</i>	223
5.3.2	<i>Liberal democratic societies</i>	225
5.4	<i>The not so slippery slope response</i>	228
5.4.1	<i>Courts and legal reasoning</i>	229
5.4.2	<i>Legislative processes</i>	233
5.4.3	<i>Evolving social norms</i>	240
5.5	<i>The reaching the bottom of the slope is not so bad response</i>	244
5.5.1	<i>According to whose yardstick of objectionableness?</i>	245
5.5.2	<i>Race, religion, sexual orientation, disability and gender identity</i>	246
5.5.3	<i>Political beliefs, activities or affiliations</i>	249
5.6	<i>The true colours response</i>	254
5.7	<i>The burden of proof response</i>	256
5.8	<i>Conclusion</i>	258
<b>6</b>	<b>Some other (bad) political arguments against hate speech laws</b>	<b>264</b>
6.1	<i>Introduction</i>	264
6.2	<i>Arguments concerning bad intentions</i>	266
6.2.1	<i>The cautionary tale argument</i>	266
6.2.2	<i>The smokescreen argument</i>	269
6.3	<i>Arguments about unintended consequences</i>	270
6.3.1	<i>The political bias argument</i>	270
6.3.2	<i>The reverse-enforcement argument</i>	272
6.3.3	<i>The balkanization argument</i>	275
6.4	<i>Arguments about whether democratic communities actually want hate speech laws</i>	282
6.4.1	<i>The will of the people argument</i>	282
6.4.2	<i>The opinion poll argument</i>	284
6.5	<i>Scholarly arguments as political arguments</i>	289
6.5.1	<i>The horns of a dilemma argument</i>	290
6.5.2	<i>The argument from ideological bias</i>	290
6.6	<i>Arguments which are liable to attract the charge of hypocrisy</i>	295
6.6.1	<i>The political correctness argument</i>	295
6.6.2	<i>The melodramas argument</i>	296
6.6.3	<i>The name calling argument</i>	296
6.6.4	<i>The well-meaning fools argument</i>	297
6.6.5	<i>The use of metaphor argument</i>	297
6.6.6	<i>The self-appointed do-gooders argument</i>	297
6.6.7	<i>The insulting victims of hate speech argument</i>	299
6.6.8	<i>The argument from what is fashionable</i>	299
6.7	<i>Conclusion</i>	301

<b>PART III</b>	
<b>Hyperpolitical hate speech and what to do about it</b>	<b>305</b>
<b>7 Do political figures have any special moral duties to refrain from hate speech?</b>	<b>307</b>
7.1 <i>Introduction</i>	307
7.2 <i>What potentially makes hyperpolitical hate speech a special case?</i>	310
7.3 <i>Violent effects</i>	315
7.3.1 <i>What sort of causation?</i>	316
7.3.2 <i>Alternative explanatory frameworks</i>	318
7.3.3 <i>The case of misogynistic hate speech</i>	320
7.3.4 <i>The case of racial, nationalist or religious hate speech</i>	323
7.3.5 <i>Why can the hate speech of political figures be especially dangerous?</i>	325
7.4 <i>Harms to democracy, government and public goods</i>	327
7.4.1 <i>Equal participation</i>	327
7.4.2 <i>Trust in government</i>	333
7.4.3 <i>Faith in democracy</i>	335
7.4.4 <i>Confidence in lawmaking</i>	338
7.4.5 <i>Assurance of civic dignity</i>	341
7.5 <i>Threats to the autonomy of the audience</i>	342
7.6 <i>Arguments from counter-speech</i>	345
7.7 <i>Political ethics</i>	347
7.7.1 <i>Mutual respect and the duty to refrain from hate propaganda</i>	348
7.7.2 <i>Mutual respect and the duty to refrain from negative stereotyping, denigration and vilification</i>	350
7.7.3 <i>Does anti-hate speech rhetoric ('basket of deplorables') itself show mutual respect?</i>	352
7.7.4 <i>Ethic of responsibility</i>	354
7.8 <i>Some other bad things political figures do with hate speech</i>	358
7.8.1 <i>Legitimising ordinary hate speech</i>	358
7.8.2 <i>Miseducating ordinary hate speakers</i>	362
7.8.3 <i>Lending authority to ordinary hate speakers</i>	363
7.8.4 <i>Normalising ordinary hate speech</i>	365
7.9 <i>Conclusion</i>	368
<b>8 Policy options for tackling hyperpolitical hate speech</b>	<b>373</b>
8.1 <i>Introduction</i>	373
8.2 <i>Is doing nothing an option? Arguments for and against the status quo</i>	376
8.2.1 <i>Hyperpolitical speech as political speech/public discourse</i>	376
8.2.2 <i>Chilling the speech of political figures</i>	381

- 8.2.3 *Inhibiting the preferred manners of speech and speech actions of political figures* 385
- 8.2.4 *Hyperpolitical hate speech and real politics* 386
- 8.2.5 *An issue of responsibility* 391
- 8.2.6 *Informed voters* 393
- 8.2.7 *Perverse incentives for political figures to hide their true opinions* 394
- 8.3 *Normative political legitimacy* 395
- 8.4 *Legal measures* 400
  - 8.4.1 *Enact hate speech laws that apply without fear or favour to political figures* 400
  - 8.4.2 *Revise existing hate speech laws to remove accommodations made for hyperpolitical hate speech* 405
  - 8.4.3 *Disapply parliamentary privilege to hate speech laws in the field of criminal law* 409
  - 8.4.4 *Disapply parliamentary privilege to hate speech laws in the field of civil litigation* 410
  - 8.4.5 *Disapply parliamentary privilege to hate speech laws in the field of hybrid civil proceedings* 414
  - 8.4.6 *Disapply parliamentary privilege to hate speech laws on a blanket rule basis* 415
  - 8.4.7 *Disapply parliamentary privilege to hate speech laws on a selective blanket rule basis* 421
  - 8.4.8 *Disapply parliamentary privilege to hate speech laws on a case by case basis* 423
  - 8.4.9 *Create new sentencing guidelines for hate speech offences committed by political figures* 430
  - 8.4.10 *Enact bespoke hate speech laws for hyperpolitical speech* 431
- 8.5 *Quasi-legal measures* 433
  - 8.5.1 *Parliamentary codes of conduct* 434
  - 8.5.2 *No-one should be judge in his own case* 440
  - 8.5.3 *Contempt for parliamentary colleagues and abuse of parliamentary privilege* 443
  - 8.5.4 *Codes of conduct adopted by political parties* 445
  - 8.5.5 *Regulation of hyperpolitical hate speech on the Internet* 446
- 8.6 *Complementary and/or transitional measures* 448
  - 8.6.1 *Withdrawal of monetary support for some political parties* 448
  - 8.6.2 *Mandatory anti-hatred pledges for parliamentarians* 449
  - 8.6.3 *Mandatory anti-hatred training for parliamentarians* 451
  - 8.6.4 *Mandatory anti-hatred training for political candidates* 451
  - 8.6.5 *Right of reply procedures in parliament* 452
- 8.7 *Conclusion* 454

9	What does the future hold?	464
9.1	<i>Introduction</i>	464
9.2	<i>Is contextualism the enemy of objective criticism?</i>	465
9.3	<i>Does it really matter if some people think hate speech laws are an extension of the dictatorship of liberal values?</i>	467
9.4	<i>Will the use of hate speech by political figures decrease in the future?</i>	472
9.5	<i>Would it be a good or a bad thing if political figures feel less able to use hate speech in the future?</i>	476
	 <i>Bibliography</i>	481
	<i>Index</i>	519