

Hate Speech Revisited

SCHOOL OF HUMAN RIGHTS RESEARCH SERIES, Volume 45.

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

Hate Speech Revisited
A comparative and historical perspective on hate speech law
in the Netherlands and England & Wales

Marloes van Noorloos



Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd
Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road
Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom
mail@intersentia.co.uk

This book has been defended at Utrecht University on 16 December 2011.

Marloes van Noorloos
Hate Speech Revisited
A comparative and historical perspective on hate speech law in the Netherlands
and England & Wales

Cover illustration © Nur Acar Tangün (2006), www.nuracartangun.com

Typesetting: Wieneke Matthijsse, Willem Pompe Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology,
Utrecht University

ISBN 978-1-78068-032-3
NUR 828

© 2011 Intersentia
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is
available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photo copy, microfilm or any other means,
without written permission from the publishers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Four years ago my attention was drawn to an advertisement for a Ph.D. researcher on “the implications of countering discrimination and radicalisation through criminal law on hate speech”, a subject matter so fascinating that I just had to apply for this position. Now, four years later, I can only say that the topic has never failed to intrigue me – and a quick look at the Dutch newspapers in the past year shows that I am not the only one intrigued by it.

Choosing to conduct Ph.D. research has been one of the best decisions I have made so far. It has given me the chance to develop as a scholar, but has also given me the freedom to develop many other skills and to get to know other academic disciplines. For this I am indebted first of all to my supervisors, Chrisje Brants and Jenny Goldschmidt. It has been a great pleasure and an honour to work with you. Chrisje, it has been fascinating to experience your passion for legal comparison and the British legal system and I have also enjoyed discussing travel destinations and many other things with you (either over a Dutch coffee or a Persian lunch). Jenny, your kindness and your vigorous work to promote human rights have been a great inspiration. Both of you have given me freedom in conducting my research and many other activities, and this work has benefited much from your inspiring comments. I owe many thanks to Henk Kummeling, Theo de Roos, Gavin Phillipson, Leonard Besselink and Arend Soeteman for taking the time to read and comment on my manuscript. Special thanks go to Theo de Roos, who has been so kind to engage me in his research on DNA-legislation and in the Meijers Committee.

I am grateful to Peter Alldridge and Janette Monk from the School of Law at Queen Mary, University of London for giving me the chance to research the British legal system in depth. I would also like to express my gratitude to Maleiha Malik, Eric Heinze and Perry Keller for sharing their invaluable knowledge with me, amongst other things during a seminar on “hate speech”. I would also like to thank Arwel Jones and Ian Cram. Moreover, I would like to thank Eric Barendt for being so generous to welcome me in his great classes on freedom of speech at University College London.

The Willem Pompe Institute has been a very pleasant place to conduct my Ph.D. research, with the Pompe barbecues and aio-lunches in Utrecht city centre as much needed distractions from the Ph.D. Special thanks go to Wieneke Matthijsse for her meticulous editing of this book. I would also like to mention John Vervaele who gave me the opportunity to present my research abroad.

Acknowledgements

Finally, I would like to thank my paranymphs Femke and Cindy and my parents Jan and Ans for their support. Most of all I want to thank Paul for all his patience and encouragement.

Marloes van Noorloos
Utrecht, October 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Introduction	1
1 Introduction	1
2 Research goals and research question	2
3 Delineation	4
4 Methodology	5
5 Relevance	6
6 Readers' guide	7
II Theoretical framework	9
1 Introduction	9
Part A General theoretical framework	9
2 Liberalism, neutrality, toleration	9
3 Democracy and fundamental rights	12
3.1 Conceptions of democracy and the role of fundamental rights	12
3.1.1 Majority decision-making v. the interests of minorities	12
3.1.2 Democracy v. fundamental rights	14
3.2. The democratic paradox	15
3.2.1 Terrorism, democracy and fundamental rights	17
3.2.2 Extreme politics v. rational politics and public discourse	20
4 Fundamental rights: liberty and equality	22
4.1 Equality: vulnerable groups and identity politics	24
4.2 Changing modes of discrimination	26
5 Limitations to liberty	28
Part B Freedom of expression and the restriction of hate speech	32
6 Freedom of expression: justifications	33
6.1 The marketplace of ideas	33
6.2 Democracy and free speech	36
6.3 Free speech and autonomy of the individual	37
6.4 Free speech, toleration and civic virtues	38
6.5 Instrumental arguments against regulating expressions	39
7 Justifications for restrictions of speech	39
7.1 Harm to public order	39
7.1.1 Subversive speech, public order, national security	41

7.1.2	Public order and hatred between groups	43
7.1.3	Civility and decency	44
7.2	Negative imaging and discrimination	45
7.2.1	The effects of hate speech bans on victims and defendants	49
7.3	Equality	50
7.4	Mental harm to individuals	51
7.5	Offence	53
7.6	Distinguishing truth from lie	54
8	Conclusion	55
III The European Convention on Human Rights		57
1	Introduction	57
2	Article 10 ECHR: general framework	57
3	Theoretical rationales for freedom of speech under the ECHR	59
3.1	The argument from democracy	60
3.2	The argument from individual autonomy	61
3.3	A special role for freedom of speech?	63
4	Hate speech	63
4.1	Article 17 ECHR in hate speech cases	65
4.2	Holocaust denial	66
4.3	Article 17 – immigration and integration	70
4.4	Hate speech under article 10	71
4.5	Towards positive obligations in hate speech cases?	76
4.6	Conclusion	77
5	Blasphemy and defamation of religion	79
5.1	Restrictions of article 10: Otto-Preminger-Institut, Wingrove and I.A.	79
5.2	Violations of article 10: Giniewski v. France, Tatlav v. Turkey	84
5.3	Positive obligations in the field of article 9 v. article 10	86
5.4	Conclusion	87
6	Religiously motivated hate speech	90
6.1	Anti-secular political parties: Refah Partisi and others v. Turkey	90
6.2	Anti-secular speech	94
6.3	Conclusion	97
7	Extreme speech	100
7.1	Zana, Yalçın and Incal v. Turkey: political speech	101
7.2	Sürek v. Turkey (1)	102
7.3	Öztürk and other glorification cases	104
7.4	Hogefeld v. Germany	106
7.5	The media and terrorism	107
7.6	Leroy v. France and Vajnai v. Hungary	107
7.7	Article 15 ECHR: derogation in times of emergency	110
7.8	Subversive political parties	111

7.9	Conclusion	115
8	Overall conclusion	118
IV	The European Union and the Council of Europe	121
1	Introduction	121
2	Hate speech	121
2.1	CoE Committee of Ministers Recommendation (97)20 on “hate speech”	121
2.2	Additional Protocol to the Convention on cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems	123
2.3	Blasphemy and religious hatred: Resolutions and Recommendations by the CoE Parliamentary Assembly	125
2.4	EU: the Framework Decision on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law	128
3	Extreme speech: incitement to terrorism	132
3.1	Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism	132
3.2	EU: the Framework Decision amending Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on Combating Terrorism	135
4	Conclusion	138
V	International law	141
1	Introduction	141
2	The Universal Declaration of Human Rights	141
3	The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	142
3.1	Article 19 ICCPR	143
3.3.1	Defamation of religions in the UN	147
3.2	Article 5 ICCPR	150
3.3	Article 20 ICCPR	151
3.3.1	Article 20(1): War propaganda	152
3.3.2	Advocacy of hatred (article 20(2))	153
3.3.3	The relationship between articles 19 and 20	155
3.3.4	Individual petitions: Holocaust denial	157
3.3.5	Individual petitions: extreme speech and terrorism	160
3.3.5.1	UN Security Council Resolution 1624 (2005)	162
4	The Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination	163
4.1	Article 4 CERD	163
4.1.1	Scope of “racial discrimination”	165
4.2	Background	168
4.3	The “due regard” clause	168
4.4	Positive obligations and prosecutorial discretion	170

5	The 1948 Genocide Convention and the international crime of “incitement to genocide”	174
6	Conclusion	178
VI	The Netherlands	181
1	Introduction	181
2	Developments in hate speech law and rationales after 2001	181
2.1	Legislative proposals: “glorifying terrorism”	185
2.2	Legislative proposals: genocide denial	188
2.3	Legislative proposals: abolition of the law on blasphemy?	189
2.4	Legislative proposals: abolishing articles 137c-d	190
2.5	Developments in prosecution policy	190
2.6	Socio-political background	192
3	Hate speech and freedom of expression up to the 1940s	195
3.1	The Constitution: freedom of expression	195
3.2	New speech offences in the 1930s: group insult (article 137c)	197
3.3	New speech offences in the 1930s: blasphemy (article 147)	199
3.4	Freedom of expression and public debate around the 1930s	200
3.5	Militant democracy in the 1930s	202
4	After the war: the 1950s	204
4.1	Militant democracy	204
4.2	Public debate and minorities after the war	206
5	The 1960s/70s	207
5.1	Depillarisation and polarisation	207
5.2	The debate about immigration	208
5.3	Changes in the law: articles 137c/d	210
5.3.1	Changing rationale	211
5.3.2	The scope of article 137c	211
5.3.3	Groups protected	212
5.3.4	Effective use of articles 137c/d	212
5.3.5	Interpretation by the courts	213
5.3.6	Party proscriptions	214
5.3.6.1	Militant democracy and the Constitution	215
5.4	Freedom of expression	215
5.5	Blasphemy	217
6	The 1980s/1990s	218
6.1	Changes in the law: articles 137c/d	218
6.1.1	Rationale	219
6.1.2	Non-discrimination and freedom of expression in the Constitution	220
6.1.3	Proposal for a “freedom of expression clause”	221
6.1.4	Effective use of hate speech bans	221
6.2	Interpretation by the courts	223

6.2.1	Political discourse about immigration and multiculturalism in the 1980s/1990s	223
6.2.1.1	Columns and satire	224
6.2.2	Indirect insult; harm v. offence	225
6.3	Political parties & militant democracy	225
6.4	The debate on immigration	228
7	After 2001 – revisited	229
7.1	Interpretation by the courts	229
7.1.1	Article 10 ECHR	230
7.1.2	Religious motivation & contextual interpretation	231
7.1.3	Case law on the debate about immigration	233
7.1.4	Indirect insult and indirect incitement on the grounds of religion	235
7.1.5	Article 137d: indirect incitement and speech-consequences	236
7.1.6	The prosecution of Geert Wilders	237
7.1.7	Radicalisation, extreme speech and hate speech: the Hofstadgroep	244
7.2	Wider developments: public debate and political culture	246
7.2.1	Conflicting visions on freedom of expression and hate speech	247
7.2.2	The political system and “media logic”	249
VII	England and Wales	253
1	Introduction	253
2	Developments in hate speech law after 2001	253
2.1	Stirring up religious hatred – part 3A Public Order Act 1986	253
2.1.1	Civil liberties and human rights	259
2.1.2	Prosecutions for stirring up racial and religious hatred after 2001	260
2.2	Stirring up hatred on the grounds of sexual orientation	262
2.3	Blasphemous libel	265
2.4	Seditious libel	268
2.5	Encouragement of terrorism: the Terrorism Act 2006	269
2.5.1	Prosecutions for encouragement of terrorism	272
2.6	Discussion on section 5 Public Order Act 1986	273
2.6.1	Proposals for amendment of section 5 POA ‘86	277
2.7	Hate speech since 9/11: wider background	278
3	Historical/constitutional framework	280
3.1	Freedom of expression and its restrictions before the Human Rights Act 1998	280
3.1.1	Civil liberties and Parliamentary Sovereignty	282
3.1.2	Restricting speech against the mainstream: seditious libel and blasphemous libel	285
3.2	The 1930s-1950s: the Public Order Act 1936	286
3.3	The 1960s-1970s: Race relations	287
3.3.1	Race relations: politics and the media in the 1960s-1970s	292

3.4	The 1980s: public order & national security	295
3.5	The 1990s: the Human Rights Act 1998, changes in media landscape	298
3.5.1	Racism, the media and society in the 1990s	299
4	After 2001 revisited	300
VIII Synthesis		303
1	Introduction	303
2	The law on hate speech and extreme speech	303
3	The courts and freedom of expression	304
4	International influences	306
4.1	European law	307
5	Hate speech: race, religion and the boundaries of public debate	309
6	Prosecution for hate speech	311
7	Rationales	312
7.1	Public order and negative imaging	312
7.2	Social cohesion and common values	314
7.3	Blasphemy and religious hatred: offence and legal moralism	314
8	Protection of the majority and minorities	316
8.1	The blurring of hate speech and extreme speech	316
8.2	Hate speech bans and majority interests	317
8.3	“Glorifying terrorism” and majority interests	317
8.4	Religiously motivated speech	318
8.5	Background: militant democracy	319
9	Freedom of expression in political culture	322
10	Shifts in public debate, politics and the media after 2001	325
10.1	Freedom of expression as a “trump card”	327
Afterword		329
Samenvatting		331
Bibliography		341
Curriculum vitae		367