

Freedom of speech



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Freedom of Speech School Freedom of speech covers not only the freedom to speak literally but the freedom to express oneself through a variety of forms including the arts – painting, dancing, singing, and so on. Once these expressions do not offend others then it is one's right to be allowed such freedom. In the case of *Vicenty v. Bloomberg* (Find Law n. d.), the court should grant the plaintiff their request because they have never been found to be involved in any acts of vandalism relating to the painting of graffiti. They want to use the banned items to carry on their painting whether for enjoyment, for school or as a means of earning an income. The law should not limit them from using the best tools available, which is what currently exists. This ban is not only discriminatory but unreasonable. It assumes that the persons involved in vandalism are under the age of 21. Further, it suggests that persons in that age group are not able to decipher what constitutes wholesome, responsible and proper behavior from what does not. This ban is an act of suppression of the right to progress beyond limits placed by the authorities. It forces persons under the age of 21 to break laws which hinders on their progress and prevents them from expressing themselves in a wholesome manner. In so doing it casts them in the light of being law breakers. It needlessly casts a level of guilt on that age group and reduces them to the level of criminals when they are really not engaged in wrongdoing. If freedom of speech is to remain the right of all this discriminatory and suppressive ban needs to be removed as it cuts at the core of creativity. The youths should not be made to pay in any way for societal problems such as that which caused the ban. Reference Find Law (n. d.). *Vincenty v. Bloomberg*. Retrieved from: <http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-2nd-circuit/1070582.html>

<https://assignbuster.com/freedom-of-speech/>