

Hate Speech, Free Speech, and the Limits of Expression

Posted on October 9, 2018

Introduction

Freedom of speech and hate speech cross each other when using the first right, which is the freedom to express. According to the Constitution of the United States of America, every person has the right to speak or express anything, and no one has the authority to stop anyone. However, the concern raised by Will Saletan in his article "How can we ban insults against Jews but not Muslims" is that the influence of perception on the right to speech is causing great distress in different communities sharing the world. As the name suggests, in America, a common perception gives an open platform to everyone speaking in favour of Jews, but when it comes to the Muslim community, speaking in favour of them directly indicates that the person is supporting terrorism. It's not just limited to religion, but calling Gays promiscuous and all the crimes committed by the black community also comes in that perception. The suggested view on this attitude is that of being the hypocrite, which only gives rights to people they wish to and is not commonly shared.

Discussion

The writer indicates that the foreign policy of America is influenced by the Jews because all the policies go in favour of Jews and against those countries where Muslims are in the majority. This is purely a violation of freedom of speech because it is not considered to be Nobel to speak when everyone is not speaking. The policies and constitution are being designed by conservative and racist people who are always against Muslims and blacks. Even after the civil rights revolution in which Blacks secured their rights still, they faced discrimination, which caused their socio-economic condition badly. The people living in Islamic countries are angry at this hypocrisy and protesting against such acts of America. When it comes to hate speech for Prophet Muhammad, America considers this as [free speech](#) or freedom of speech, but people are not allowed to speak about the Holocaust.

The writer further gave the UN General meeting in which Presidents from the Muslim community proposed the banning of such speeches that promote hate among different communities. President condemned the video, which was spreading hate against Muslims, and the Swiss president, who always spoke against hate speech, was found silent when the magazine provoked and offended the Muslim community. The East and West are always found arguing on this topic, and it should not be ignored that the Arabs have gone through different difficult phases in order to stabilize the condition

of their country. All the Muslim countries are against this attitude of America towards hate speech and raising their voices on this issue. The ambassador of Pakistan openly expressed that in Europe and America, the discrimination towards Muslims is a double standard.

Throughout developed countries, it is forbidden to express anything that hurts the feelings of any community. Those who showed any support to the Nazis will have to face jail, but if anyone showed hatred and expressed hate towards the Muslim community would be praised rather than the law applied to him/her. Even Germany, which once showed the most hatred toward Jews, now follows the laws which forbid people to express hate and hurt the community. Furthermore, the writer gave similar examples of different countries, from Germany to the United Kingdom and also referred to international laws against hate speech. Unfortunately, all of them only provide support and show sympathy to Jews but nothing for other communities and races. The hate speech is not limited to religion but to gays as well. Several examples have been given by the writer who provided the example that religious people spread hate against them, and there are even places where homosexual people have to hide their views in order to protect their well-being.

In the end, the writer argues regarding the laws that were imposed by the human rights organizations and the constitutions of the countries regarding the freedom of speech being used as hate speech. The writer emphasized that all the laws should be implemented regardless of any favours to a particular community. If Jews have the privilege to be protected by the law, then why don't Muslims have such rights? We all should live in peace by eliminating the hate against each other (Saletan, 2018).

Conclusions

The writer has stated many strong points, including the examples he provided, which showed how biased the law implementers are in that they ignore the sentiments of Muslim communities and always blame black people for criminals. The article is convincing enough to agree with the writer that the conservative and racist lawmakers are exploiting the constitute of America. Molding the laws according to their own benefits. In the meantime, it should also be considered that freedom of expression gives the power to those who have the right to speak what is right and when the wrong thing happens. The perception against Muslims has been built by terrorism, and people are afraid of them, which has turned into such hate speech. The sentence structure of Saletan becomes vague when the name of the article is different than what is actually being expressed as the name suggests that in America, a common perception gives an open platform to everyone for speaking in favour of Jews, but when it comes to the Muslim community, speaking in favour of them directly indicates that the person is supporting the terrorism. It's not just limited to religion, but calling Gays promiscuous and all the crimes committed by the black community also comes in that perception. The suggested view on this attitude is that of being the hypocrite, which only gives rights to people they wish to and is not commonly shared.

Works Cited

Saletan, W. (2018). *Hate-Speech Hypocrites*. [online] <http://www.slate.com>. Available at: <http://www.slate.com/news-and-politics/2018/03/the-steel-dossier-that-could-hurt-trump-in-november.html> [Accessed 10 Mar. 2018].