



Working Session No 14 (10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.)
Specifically Selected Topic: Hate Crime – Participating State’s Compliance

OSCE / ODIHR
Warsaw, Poland
25 September 2019

Thank you, madam moderator, ladies and gentlemen. At a formal OSCE Side Event in Warsaw in 2013, we got the drafters of the “Islamophobia” narrative to acknowledge that the term has no central definition.

In 2017, on the 20th Anniversary of Runnymede’s *“Islamophobia – A Challenge for Us All,”* Runnymede put out *“Islamophobia – Still a Challenge for Us All”* where, yet again, it was acknowledged that Islamophobia “still does not have an agreed, published definition” before offering its own definition, *“Islamophobia is anti-Muslim racism,”* which happens to be the same definition the *Organization of Islamic Cooperation* promulgated in 2005 when declaring it a *“new form of racism.”*

In September 2019, the *Tony Blair Institute for Global Change* issued *Designating Hate – New Policy Responses to Stop Hate Crimes* that likewise designated Islamophobia a form of racism while also affirming that the term lacks for a definition - all the while seeking its aggressive criminalization. To no-one’s surprise, the Tony Blair report also acknowledges that *Hate Crime* has no definition.

At a May 2015 OSCE event in Vienna, at an official forum, we got an OSCE panel to admit that saying something known to be true can constitute hate speech.

As of May 2019, the UN General Secretary Antonio Guterres, in a speech on the *“United Nations Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech”* called for stepped up action to prosecute Hate Speech even as the UN officially acknowledged that the term lacks definition.

It is not a coincidence that both *Islamophobia* and *Hate Crimes* converge on repurposed Neo-Marxist notions of *racism* to be arbitrated by unelected diplomats in international forums where the people are cut off from any meaningful participation. The energy behind prosecuting these *“known-to-lack-definition”* attack narratives is chilling.

Of course, as we are constantly reminded, *“we all know what it is.”* And we do! It is the granting to the state the *arbitrary authority* to prosecute its citizens for any reason or no reason at all. We will have those definitions after it’s too late to stop the



process. When that happens, we will have completed the transition from citizens to subjects.

Just consider all the aphorisms built around slogans calling for the suppression of those who **“seek to divide us!”** Stripped of their saccharin narratives, these phrases, in the guise of prosecuting hate speech and Islamophobia, would give the state the **arbitrary power** to criminalize the dissent of its citizens. ***This is the rhetoric of totalitarianism.*** It is the abuse of language leading to the abuse of power. In forums like this, we are left to ponder whether our delegates are gullible, cynical or both.

Unconstrained Analytics recommends that the OSCE and all participating States – reconsider hate speech and Islamophobia. As they now stand, they are attack narratives designed to suppress free expression. Certainly, implementation should be suspended until articulable definitions are provided. Thank you!