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Freedom of Speech vs. Religious Sentiments: 
A ‘Shouting Match’?²²

Rafael Palomino²³

In 2009 several professors at Universidad Complutense promoted a research group²⁴ to analyse the dimensions of the “Muhammad Cartoons Affair” of 2005²⁵. The purpose of our project (a tiny part of a wider scholar spontane-

²² Rafael Palomino, professor at the Universidad Complutense, Madrid, Spain


²⁴ Part of the results were published, along with contributions from other European scholars, in J. MARTÍNEZ-TORRÓN; S. CAÑAMARES ARRIBAS (eds.), Tensiones entre libertad de expresión y libertad religiosa, Tirant lo Blanch, Valencia, 2014.

ous movement\textsuperscript{26} was to understand the conflict and to find legal clues in order to provide an enduring solution to the dramatic global affairs we were gazing at. We thought “perhaps naively” that we were facing an outbreak of violence and misunderstanding which once cooled over time could be studied in a quiet academic environment. Nothing could be further from the truth, since the Muhammad Cartoons Affair have been repeated (in a different fashion) again and again in the period of ten years. The last episode took place in Paris, in January 2015. The apparent confrontation between “secular speech” and “religious sentiments” (which has been the more frequent confrontation during these years) could lead to draw the conclusion that the problem is a one-way street in which the Western-secularized world is attacking the religious-Eastern world. However, it is also true that the “religious speech” has been labelled as “offensive” to secular sentiments “at home” (especially in the gender ideology sphere...).

The conflict was far from being “spontaneously” solved, since the opponents have reaffirmed their own positions; i.e., the Western media have responded to the attacks with “more speech” and radical Islam sectors have reacted with “more bullets.” In the end, this “shouting match” has claimed many innocent lives, has distanced us from each other, has hindered the advancement of human rights and has buried dialogue as a tool for promoting peace among Peoples.

\textsuperscript{26} L. ZUCCA, Constitutional Dilemmas: Conflicts of Fundamental Legal Rights in Europe and the USA, Oxford University Press, Oxford; New York, 2007, p. 51.

It is easy to infer that our research group didn’t reach the promising solution we envisaged at the beginning of our academic work. However, after three years of legal study (comparing the laws of different countries, analysing international legal instruments and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights) we reached several conclusions concerning the seemingly unsolvable conflict between freedom of expression and religious sentiments. It would be pretentious on my part to try to synthesize all the conclusions (or to take the role of spokesman for all my colleagues of the research group!) Instead, I shall offer some personal ideas below.

It is important to underscore that in almost all cases there is not a legal conflict strito sensu between freedom of religion and freedom of speech. A real legal conflict arises when “a right makes something permissible while a competing right makes it impermissible.” And this is not the case: the fact that someone utters hurtful speech which is judged by the listener as insulting, annoying or even blasphemous, does not mean necessarily to infringe upon the right of others to have, change or to adopt a religion or belief, either individually or in community, or to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching... Besides, the right to speech does not entail the right not to listen. “Freedom of speech puts the emphasis on the speaker and what is said (...) A worrying trend is the shift toward the hearer and to what is being heard or how things are perceived, including the possibility that an individual or group may feel hurt or offended by what has been expressed. This is a move from the objective (what was expressed) to the subjective (how it was received, perceived). This is contrary to fundamental Rule of Law.”

To be sure, only in those instances in which offensive speech “is very likely to lead to violence and death are these grounds a reason in favor of state sanctioning. The same applies to the fact that offending someone’s religious beliefs is very likely to cause severe psychological distress or damage to that person.”

This being said, it is also undisputed that “a social environment of free exchange of ideas and free speech including the free expression of beliefs” is essential for democracy. Conversely, a social environment dominated by verbal aggression or violence is certainly not the most suitable habitat for the exercise


of freedoms. From this perspective, attacks on religion are not inherently different from attacks based on sex, race or national origin; and all these factors are mentioned by Article 14 ECHR, which prohibits discrimination." \(^{29}\)

In addition, the new scenario in which speech and religious sentiments collide has its own new and peculiar features. In part, this is due to the “unforeseen potential audience” of offensive speech. Internet makes possible to reach countries and cultures in which the context and the reactions cannot be measured according to the expectations of Western media. Many years ago, Oliver Wendell Holmes underscored the role that circumstances and places play in free speech limitation cases: “The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theatre and causing a panic. It does not even protect a man from an injunction against uttering words that may have all the effect of force. (...) The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree.” \(^{30}\)

Nowadays the relevance of context increases insofar as internet and technology make almost impossible to know (let’s return to Wendell Holmes) whether we are in a theatre, whether the theatre is empty or crowded, and whom exactly is the audience (firemen? pyromaniacs?).

In a globalized context, we might think and act in different ways and with different attitudes. **First**, we may think and act locally: “Here in Europe freedom of speech is sacred, it includes the right to publish something which could be considered insulting or blasphemous... Free speech is equal to all: I may say “X”, you may say “Y”... Free market of ideas is part of the rules of the game. —What about Pakistan or Nigeria? Well, that's not our problem...” **Second**, thinking locally and acting globally: “Everyone everywhere must respect human rights. Let’s exercise freedom of speech worldwide to change this world, let’s respond to more violence with more speech. —What about Pakistan or Nigeria? Well, the cause of freedom may bring forth martyrdom.” **And finally**, thinking globally and acting globally: “Freedom of speech is a fundamental human right every human being possesses. Though there are utterances that reach beyond our cultural boundaries... So, let’s also think about those innocent people, let’s exercise freedom responsibly.”


\(^{30}\) Schenck v. United States, 249 U.S. 47 at 52 (1919).
The last option is not only an “ethical” one. When recognizing freedom of speech, the European Convention of Human Rights points out that this right “carries with it duties and responsibilities.” In a global context, not all duties and responsibilities are compiled in domestic law. “Freedom of expression must include a legal right to offend. But not, in all circumstances, the complete license to do so.”

Besides, globalization made us experience religion as multi-faceted. In the dominant Western thought, religion is a matter of choice, is part of the ideas that one may or may not have, leave or change. However, in the Eastern world religion is considered to be part of personal identity. The Western press sometimes intends to ridicule or criticize “ideas,” not people. And yet, the Eastern effect turns out to be quite different. This is not to say that freedom of speech has to be measured according to the hearer’s sensibility, but encourages one to realize the complexity of religion in global context.

Violence is not the legitimate response to speech, we all know that. And violent responses on the part of extremists (both in Muslim and non-Muslim countries, let us always be reminded of this) require serious internal reflection and action inside the Muslim world. At the same time, freedom of speech in the area of religious sentiments requires a certain amount of sensitivity and responsibility. As a Spanish scholar pointed out in 2012 on the occasion of one of the terrible episodes of this long-term affair when Parliament and the Libyan people asked forgiveness for the murder of the US ambassador and, at the same, time demanded respect for Islamic beliefs, they began to walk the right path. They rejected violence but demanded decency by the West. Indeed, in a diverse – but sometimes deranged – society unfair attacks on the great religions are not uncommon. The problem is how to react fairly.