

## YES—Arguments to Support the Deliberation Question

1. Hate speech is despicable, but it is not a crime. While certain words hurt and are hateful, they are only words—the pain they cause is a small price to pay for freedom.
2. Just because something is legal does not mean it is necessarily acceptable or desirable. A better way to fight hateful speech and ideas is through the use of free expression and “loving” speech to promote the kind of society that people want.
3. Laws that prohibit hate speech will have the effect of “chilling” free speech. If the government has the power to punish expression, the definition of prohibited speech will grow. All governments resist giving up powers they already have. Governments should be permitted to control only what people can and cannot do, not what they say or believe.
4. In order for laws to be effective, they have to be workable. Laws that prohibit hate speech keep the government involved in making never-ending lists of “permitted” and “forbidden” expressions. That wastes public money and effort. The police and the courts can use their time better by prosecuting and punishing actions, not thoughts.
5. Expression is ambiguous. A symbol of hate for one group is a symbol of solidarity for another group. Government should punish only the actions people take against each other. Government should not punish how people think or how people express themselves.