Why Should Violence Speech Be Banned?

Posted on January 27, 2020

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/why-should-violence-speech-be-banned/

Introduction

Speech can contribute to violence, but the phrase “violent speech” must be defined carefully before law is used to prohibit it. A democratic society protects criticism, satire, protest, religious disagreement, and disturbing political advocacy because governments can misuse vague bans against opponents and minorities. At the same time, freedom of expression does not create immunity for true threats, intentional incitement of imminent violence, criminal solicitation, targeted harassment, or speech that forms part of unlawful conduct. The strongest argument is therefore not that every hateful or offensive statement should be banned. It is that narrowly defined speech causing or intentionally creating serious danger may be restricted through clear, evidence-based rules.

Why Words Can Create Real Harm

Words do not injure in exactly the same way as physical force, yet speech can coordinate violence, identify targets, communicate threats, and encourage audiences to attack. Propaganda may dehumanize groups over time, while direct messages can make an individual reasonably fear for personal safety. Online communication increases reach, speed, repetition, anonymity, and the ability to mobilize crowds. The harm is not limited to hurt feelings. Credible threats can force people to change homes, jobs, schools, or public participation. Incitement can turn political hostility into immediate action. Law is justified when it addresses these concrete mechanisms rather than assuming that offense alone is equivalent to violence.

The Danger of an Undefined Ban

A broad ban on “violent,” “hateful,” or “harmful” speech creates serious problems because people disagree about what those words include. Governments may label criticism of police, war, religion, monarchy, or national policy as dangerous. Majorities may define minority anger as threatening while tolerating more powerful speakers. Vague laws also encourage self-censorship because people cannot predict which statements will be punished. The rule of law requires notice, consistency, and limits on official discretion. Restrictions should therefore identify conduct, mental state, context, and likely harm. A law aimed at violence must not become a tool for suppressing unpopular viewpoints simply

because authorities dislike their tone.

Incitement and Imminent Lawless Action

In the United States, *Brandenburg v. Ohio* established a demanding standard for punishing advocacy. Speech may lose protection when it is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to produce that action. This rule distinguishes abstract approval of violence from an intentional effort to trigger immediate unlawful conduct. A speaker who argues generally that a revolution may someday be justified is different from a leader directing an armed crowd to attack a named building at once. The imminence requirement protects political debate while allowing intervention when words function as an operational command. Other legal systems draw the line differently, but clarity remains essential (United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, n.d.).

True Threats and the Speaker’s Mental State

True threats are serious expressions communicating an intent to commit unlawful violence against a person or group. Their prohibition protects safety and the ability to live without intimidation. In *Counterman v. Colorado*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the First Amendment requires attention to the speaker’s mental state and that recklessness can be sufficient: the speaker must consciously disregard a substantial risk that the communication will be understood as threatening violence. Context matters, including repetition, specificity, relationship, audience, and reaction. This approach avoids punishing accidental or misunderstood expression while recognizing that a person cannot deliberately ignore the threatening meaning of repeated messages (v, 2023).

Solicitation, Conspiracy, and Speech as Criminal Conduct

Some speech is punishable because it is part of a crime rather than because of its viewpoint. Hiring someone to commit assault, agreeing with others to carry out an attack, giving operational instructions to a criminal partner, or extorting money through threats involves communication, but the communication performs unlawful conduct. The same principle applies to fraud, witness intimidation, and certain forms of stalking. Calling every such offense a “speech ban” can obscure the distinction between expressing an idea and using words as the instrument of a crime. Law should focus on intention, agreement, action, and evidence instead of treating controversial opinion as equivalent to criminal planning.

Targeted Harassment and Repeated Intimidation

Targeted harassment can restrict another person's freedom through repeated unwanted contact, surveillance, insults linked to threats, or campaigns designed to make ordinary life unsafe. A single offensive statement in public debate is different from persistent messages sent directly to a victim after clear requests to stop. Legal responses should require a defined pattern, serious harm or reasonable fear, and safeguards for legitimate reporting, protest, labor activity, and journalism. Platforms and institutions may apply additional conduct rules in workplaces or schools, but those rules should also distinguish disagreement from intimidation. The objective is to protect participation, not to guarantee freedom from criticism.

Hate Speech and Comparative Legal Approaches

Many countries prohibit certain forms of incitement to racial, religious, or national hatred, while the United States generally protects hateful viewpoints unless they fall within categories such as threats or incitement. International human-rights law also protects expression but permits or requires restrictions in specific circumstances, including advocacy of hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility, or violence. These differences reflect distinct constitutional histories and concerns. A comparative analysis should not claim that one simple rule applies everywhere. It should evaluate whether laws define harm precisely, protect vulnerable groups, preserve political dissent, and provide independent judicial review and accessible procedures for challenge (United Nations, 1966).

Discrimination Is Not Always a Speech Offense

Racist or sexist language may provide evidence of unlawful discrimination without being independently criminal. An employer who uses slurs while denying promotion may reveal discriminatory intent; a landlord's statement may show an illegal refusal to rent; a school's repeated tolerance of targeted abuse may violate civil-rights duties. The legal issue is often the discriminatory act or hostile environment rather than the mere expression of a hateful opinion. This distinction allows law to address unequal treatment while avoiding a general power to punish beliefs. It also reminds institutions that speech can be relevant evidence even when the government could not ban the same words in ordinary public debate.

Online Platforms and Private Moderation

Constitutional free-speech rules usually restrict government, not every private platform. Social-media companies may enforce terms against threats, glorification of violence, targeted abuse, or coordinated harassment, although their decisions can have significant effects on public debate.

Platform moderation should use transparent definitions, proportionate penalties, meaningful appeals, and consistent enforcement across political groups. Automated systems may miss coded threats or incorrectly remove documentation, satire, and counterspeech. The fact that a platform can remove content does not mean every removal is wise. Responsible moderation combines human review, context, user safety, and public accountability while recognizing that private services are not identical to criminal courts.

Counter-Speech and Noncriminal Responses

Not every harmful expression should produce arrest or prosecution. Counter-speech, education, community support, civil remedies, workplace discipline, platform moderation, and security planning may respond more proportionately. Public officials can condemn dehumanizing rhetoric without creating a censorship power. Schools can teach media literacy and conflict resolution while protecting student expression. Communities can support targeted groups and document escalating patterns. Criminal law should remain a last resort for clearly defined serious harms because punishment can intensify grievance, create martyrs, or be applied selectively. A layered response recognizes that speech problems vary widely in severity, audience, intention, and causal mechanism in the surrounding context.

Evidence, Causation, and Enforcement

Claims that banning hateful speech will automatically reduce violence require evidence. Violence has multiple causes, including organization, weapons, opportunity, ideology, social conflict, and state response. Speech can be a significant factor, but enforcement must establish a credible connection between the communication and the prohibited harm. Selective prosecution is another risk: marginalized activists may be punished more readily than powerful speakers using coded language. Agencies need training, published standards, data collection, and judicial oversight. Laws should be evaluated not only by their stated purpose but by whom they actually protect, whom they punish, and whether less restrictive measures could address the danger.

A Narrow and Defensible Policy

A defensible policy would prohibit serious true threats, intentional or reckless intimidation, direct incitement likely to produce imminent unlawful action, criminal solicitation, and communication integral to violent conspiracy. Statutes should define required mental states, identify relevant context, and protect journalism, research, artistic work, historical documentation, and good-faith reporting. Penalties should be proportionate, with civil or protective remedies available where criminal punishment is unnecessary. The law should not prohibit speech merely because it expresses hatred, causes offense, or challenges prevailing morality. This approach protects people from genuine danger

while reducing the chance that government will convert public safety into viewpoint control.

Addressing the Counterargument from Absolute Freedom

Some critics argue that any restriction begins a slippery slope toward censorship. That concern deserves respect because history contains many examples of governments using security language to silence opposition. Yet absolute protection is also untenable when words communicate a credible murder threat or direct an immediate attack. The answer is not unlimited power but carefully bounded law. Courts should require evidence, mental-state findings, and close connection to harm. Defendants must receive due process, and officials should bear the burden of justifying restriction. Freedom of speech is strengthened, not weakened, when the boundary between protected advocacy and punishable coercion is principled and predictable.

Conclusion

Violent speech should not be banned through a vague rule that treats offense, anger, hatred, and violence as interchangeable. Such a law would threaten dissent and invite discriminatory enforcement. Restrictions are justified when speech operates as a true threat, intentional incitement of imminent lawlessness, criminal solicitation, targeted intimidation, or another clearly defined unlawful act. The central task is precision: identify the harm, the speaker's mental state, the context, and the connection between words and danger. Democratic societies must protect robust expression while ensuring that freedom is not used as a shield for coercion and planned violence. Narrow rules, oversight, and noncriminal alternatives provide the most defensible balance.

References

1. *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444 (1969).
2. *Counterman v. Colorado*, 600 U.S. 66 (2023).
3. *Virginia v. Black*, 538 U.S. 343 (2003).
4. United Nations. *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, arts. 19–20, 1966.
5. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. *Rabat Plan of Action*. 2012.
6. Waldron, Jeremy. *The Harm in Hate Speech*. Harvard UP, 2012.
7. Strossen, Nadine. *HATE: Why We Should Resist It with Free Speech, Not Censorship*. Oxford UP, 2018.