

Freedom of speech



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Freedom of Speech Freedom of Speech is one of the basic human rights in today's world. Freedom refers, in general terms, to independence. Freedom of speech, hence, is the independence of people to say and express what they feel about certain thing, matter or person. This freedom is the right for people as well as the source of information and new ideas for them.

However, there have been long prevailing debates over the freedom of speech and the extent of this freedom to common men. This paper aims to examine the contrary views on freedom of speech and reach a conclusion based on the argumentative facts. The paper aims to refute all arguments against freedom of speech and provides arguments against any restrictions on freedom of speech in certain countries like Canada.

Freedom of speech provides people with different views about life, political condition, people, education, society and the whole world. This freedom is not aimed to defame anyone or anything but people provide their deepest thoughts and perceptions about different issues. These varying ideas and opinions provide the uninformed with a wide range of possibilities and sufficient grounds to make their own judgement. Hence freedom of speech, in this context, must remain untied with restrictions and laws. The criticism against freedom of speech is the fact that people may use this right in order to defame other people, develop controversies and negatively change people's arguments. The criticisers believe that restrictions must be imposed in order to protect people's privacy and reputation from the abusers of this freedom. The justification to their criticism is the increasing debates over political, social and religious issues. The increasing conflicts and worsening law and order situation provide them with the chance to stand against such freedom.

In my opinion, all these arguments are, to a great extent, baseless. Milton describes in *Areopagitica* two kinds of people: the prudent ones and others who are imprudent. Prudent class of people are able to distinguish between good and bad, reasonable and unreasonable; imprudent, on the other hand, are unaffected by any judgements. In other words, we may say that prudent class has the power to analyze, assess and judge every event, claim or argument; whereas, imprudent do not have their own opinion and they lack the power of expressing and judging. Hence, imprudent remain unaffected by the opinions and expressions of others and prudent accept the claims only if they have any instance of truth in them. Moreover, it is also a noticeable fact, that any restrictions on freedom of speech may keep people from exposing the truth which is against society, political system or well-known personalities.

In conclusion, we may say that freedom of speech is a right of people and must not be violated by unnecessary laws and regulations. Freedom of speech provides people with both sides of the picture to understand the matter completely. An unbiased view is provided once people are able to analyze both positives and negatives; good and bad; pros and cons of a subject, idea or issue.