
Controversial Points Of Free Speech

“I do not agree with what you have to say, but I’ll defend to the death your right to say it”, a quote giving perspective of many on free speech. This quote gives an example of a different view some may have on this topic, and giving insight on what the true meaning of free speech is; and why it’s a natural right for all of us to have. The existence of free speech is not so that you can understand what everyone has to say, but is so that you can understand that everyone has the right to just say it. Understanding is accepting the fact that what is said makes sense to whomever is speaking, and that they truly believe in what they are saying. Understanding why anyone can say what they’d like is free speech, not whether you agree with what someone says. Along with any other amendment, right or law there is always going to be some kind of infringement. Some examples: yelling fire in a crowd around a speech or threatening the life of someone disagree with your speech.

Free speech is controversial due to many diverse approaches. Some different approaches that may morph the view on free speech are: cultural, religious, opinions, race, and history. Free speech is an umbrella term that gives us many rights that allow us to say what we want, but that doesn’t give us the right to abuse those privileges. Free speech allows us to speak our mind how we decide to. However, free speech does not allow you to threat anyone’s harm directly or indirectly. Liberals being the ones that “stifle” diversity on college campuses have a lot put on their category. Liberals are seen to be the ones who influence diversity due to their open mindset. Conservatives are seen to be the ones who hate everything and everyone but themselves. These type of things are said on behalf of both groups, but how can we trust what is said, especially with all the influence produced by social media. The community has their right to own their own opinions, but the community also has their right to share their own opinions.

The argument on free speech, in this case, is focusing on free speech on campuses. Free speech on campus is argued to not meet the requirements under the first amendment, of course this is through the eyes of the students and other locals. Freedom of speech is not a privilege that is taken away when you walk out of your car and when you take a job. Fearing losing your job when you speak your opinion is not right and that system on its own should be revised. Whether you’re a teacher or a receptionist at a dentist’s office, in either situation, you still have your natural rights; your right to your truth to be self-evident, and that all men are created equal. With that being said, you do not give up your right to free speech when you walk onto a campus.

Free speech is very vague on its own and is sometimes misinterpreted. How one uses free speech is also very vague due to their being various distributions or deliveries of their “free speech”. Using offensive language and/or symbolic gestures is sometimes needed to get one’s opinion across. Every one person is unique, which means everyone’s idea of free speech alters. There’s no “one” side on free speech because some “free speech” is dangerous and can lead to injuries, which would be an example of free speech being misused. The shift between “good” and “bad” free speech is obscured depending on the specific circumstance. An example of a “good” free speech may be a person fighting for more resources within their school and then resulting with more resources within their school. An example of a “bad” free speech may be a person fighting for the use of guns without permits and then resulting with

multiple people being shot during the duration of this event.

Being able to express yourself through speech is a very important part of your own identity. Freedom of speech is simply an extension to our natural rights and shouldn't be "up" for discussion. Speaking what's on your mind allows you to not only understand where you are coming from, but influences your own ability to understand others unique opinions. This topic being very complicated and not straight forward is what leads many people ending up confused or "neutral" on free speech as a whole. Having a "side" on behalf free speech is sort of inevitable due to it being easily viewed as yes it should be a right or no it shouldn't. The limitations are there for every right and law, for example: having a permit for you to carry a gun allows you to carry a gun, but there are limitations on how you use the gun, but common sense lets you know that using your gun to harm another human is wrong... right? There are many privileges in this country that is "legal", but that doesn't stop certain people from abusing the "legal" privileges that are here to be. Another example of a clear violation of a "right" that we have is the right to walk, a basic right, but being able to walk doesn't allow you to walk into someone's home whenever you feel like, right?

There are many different reasons why some people may disagree with the entire "free speech" topic as a whole. Some may argue that stating different alterations that may be the cause of different views is just an excuse. For example; using someone's religion as a reason why they disagree something is ignorant. In some cases, this can be true along with any other accusation, they are all subject to be either true or false. To be further clear, the entire idea and argument on free speech has been simplified to not understanding the delivery of free speech, but to understand what the sole meaning is and understanding that it's a right that every person is appointed with.