

 **TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"**  
**THAT TO WHICH**  
**I SAY ..... "HUH"!**  
**It's all a matter**  
**of perspective!**

By Stephen L. Bakke  June 25, 2015



*Here's what provoked me:*

*A writer didn't like my published response to his earlier article in which he rebuked a thoughtful article which sincerely defended the original intent of "free speech." That article's main message was that "political correctness" can sometimes hinder "freedom of speech." Here is my response – one more time.*

*Here's my response:*

**That to Which I Say ..... "HUH"! It's all a matter of perspective!**

In "Free Speech" on 6-25 Roger Quagliano accuses me, and columnist Joseph Kibitlewski, of not understanding the difference between opinions as to what is socially unacceptable (politically incorrect) and "free speech" as legislated. He distinguishes between free speech "laws" and empathetic applications of speech, which is "political correctness."

I agree entirely. But then Quagliano jumps right into associating un-empathetic speech with racism and hate speech. Having thereby painted "free speech" an evil color, he goes on to say he can't imagine any reason to be offensive, even if legal. Hence his belief in "hushing" what he considers offensive, I guess. While perfectly legal, I think his statements are unfair, even "politically incorrect," at least from my sensitive perspective.

The problem with Quagliano's self-righteousness is that he made pegerative (politically incorrect) statements about Kibitlewski's article which reminded us that "political correctness" can hinder free speech. He un-empathetically accuses Kibitlewski of "wanting to blurt out socially unacceptable epithets." My letter merely pointed out Quagliano's misinterpretation of Kibitlewski's article, to which I expressed my confusion by saying ..... HUH?

Mr. Quagliano, a sincere and thoughtful defense of the original intent of "free speech" deserves no such rebuke as you were compelled to give.