

Working Session No 12
Fundamental Freedoms (continued):
Including Freedom of Thought, Conscience, Religion or Belief

OSCE / ODIHR
Warsaw, Poland
27 September 2016

Thank you madam moderator, ladies and gentlemen,

In his *Abuse of Language, Abuse of Power*, the famous German philosopher and dissident Josef Pieper observed:

The very moment . . . that someone in full awareness employs words yet explicitly disregards reality, he in fact ceases to communicate anything to the other . . . Whoever speaks to another person – not simply . . . in spontaneous conversation but using well-considered words, and whoever in doing so is explicitly not committed to the truth . . . such a person, from that moment on, no longer considers the other as a partner, as equal. In fact, he no longer respects the other as a human person. From that moment on, . . . all conversation ceases; all dialogue and all communication come to an end.

In yesterday's intervention, the point was made that, in the name of "hate speech," everyday law-abiding citizens find their freedom of expression under attack. Attacks based on hate speech have, in fact, become the true language of stereotyping, stigmatization and discrimination.

The example given was "Islamophobia" from a Side Event at the 2013 OSCE meetings here in Warsaw, where we got principals to admit that Islamophobia has no core definition at the same time other OSCE forums were (and still are) advocating criminalizing Islamophobia.

In a Side Event yesterday, we again asked: "Can you define Islamophobia?" The answer we got was 1) Islamophobia doesn't apply to normal disagreements, 2) that it was Islamophobic to ask the question, 3) that there would be no definition provided in that forum because 4) "we all know what it means," and 5) that Islamophobia should be criminalized.



After providing an intervention, we heard an NGO and a participating State accuse our interventions of constituting hate speech that cannot be tolerated to the approving applause of some without any correction by the OSCE moderator.

Why isn't it a threat when someone says that "failure to designate Islamophobia a crime is detrimental to international peace"?

These "hate speech" narratives are designed to intimidate otherwise ordinary citizens. They impose a chilling effect on speech. As Pieper went on to say:

Wherever the main purpose of speech is flattery, there the word becomes corrupted, and necessarily so. And instead of genuine communication, there will exist something for which dominion is too benign a term; ... The ... accomplished art of flattery [is a] deceptive mirage of the political process, that is, the counterfeit usurpation of power, a power that belongs to the legitimate political authority alone.

Unconstrained Analytics recommends that the OSCE and all participating States rethink the role they play in facilitating attacks on freedom of speech masked in sophistic narratives that pretend to uphold those freedoms when in fact suppress them. Thank you!