

Free essay about free speech on college campuses

[Philosophy](#), [Freedom](#)



For several years, Universities and colleges around the globe have been faced with the problem of freedom of speech. This problem has been associated with the remarks that would alter or offend the other party. This controversy was instigated by the differences in race, creed, skin color or feminism in such institutions. According to my opinion, freedom of speech in the Universities and the colleges should not be restricted. There are several reasons that support this argument as seen through the fourth amendment. For instance, the restriction of the free speech remarks about creed, race and sexual offences might violate the rights put forward under the First Amendment. Therefore, looking at this point and applying it in the colleges then would be important to allow and tolerate such speech (Golding).

Some remarks which involve creed, race and such topics, should never be restricted as implied in the First Amendment. This is due to the fact that some of these remarks cannot be referred to as fighting words. Fighting words can be defined as those offensive or abusive words that target an individual but not a group of people. The speech should be clear to the point on the issues raised like the history of United States. When giving such a lesson in the classroom, it would be not offensive to use the word ' Negro' since it is a lesson that should be undertaken in the classroom. Someone would agree such words might be bad but also there are certain ways for controlling such words. " The problem of speech codes," written by Eugene Volokh explains ways of fighting speech codes in Harvard Law School.

Eugene talks of discussion of banning the offensive language, harassing and abusive languages from the classrooms. The Boston globe discussions comprise of some language that need to be used and the students might not

be allowed to use in the class unless the instructor calls on such usage.

Boston globe words would, therefore, favor the instructor or the professor in using words which the students are not supposed to be using thus, making the situation unfair for the students. Therefore, it would be better to make the speech free and In case the student makes rude remarks, the instructor is allowed to reprimand him` (the instructor). On the other hand, the dean or board of the school can correct and control the instructor on the word usage.

Secondly, it can be noted that by not suppressing speech in the institutions like colleges, it would be easier to diagnose some of the crucial conflicts like racism, hate speech or sexual offences. Through this method people can be able to settle down those issues instead of avoid and accumulating the grievances. Again the issues raised can be dealt with without bias or bigotry by the use of persuasion, education as well as tolerance instead of regulation, intimidation and prohibition that might lead to restriction. Charles R. Lawrence III, on “ The debate on limits on the racism” wrote of the conflicts that are brought about by the prohibition of certain speeches from the universities (Marcus). For instance, the racial violence that arises due to some incidences of symbolic assaults and verbal assaults through which the blacks undergo in universities have brought about a different picture of the racism. Okay, I agree with the fact that when one is subjected to hate speech and offensive words like the black being associated with slavery is really abusive, but facing the reality suppressing the speech cannot stop those fights but fan the flames of racism. The situation needs to be discussed openly in the institution with both blacks and the whites present. This would

bring tolerance with the two races and at the end of the day, people would be able to respect each other and accept the reality that fighting over the race is a matter of the past (O'Byrne).

Thirdly, it should be understood that the remedy for unwanted speech is not being silent but better speech. This implies that people need to know better on utterance of offensive words; otherwise, people would circumferene themselves in endless attempts to protect the other person without coming to the reality of the arbitration. It appears like a disaster in wait since both parties would remain silence over situation not known to them (Smolla).

Bok Derek's word on " The protecting Freedom of Expression In the campus", The Boston Globe which was released on 25th March 1991, explains some of the values that support the freedom of speech or unrestricted speech in the universities (Brewer). For instance, the two students from the Harvard who had their confederacy flags displayed in public were considered to be upsetting as many believed that that was a sign of slavery. There after a third student tried to display the flag through displaying swastika. The signs brought about conflicts and discussion were held over such matter since some of the students wanted the symbols removed as they were said to offend members of the community other people had the idea that the symbols should not be removed since they were show of freedom or free speech and thus they were to be protected. Some of these forms of speech have been protected under the First Amendment, but that does not mean that they are valid, civil or right. The fact remain that there could be a satisfaction to students who are proud of displaying such flags and swastikas, but it would be ruthless as well not to think of those Harvard

students who are affected by the action. It would be common sense for those students who undertook the action since they should have thought of others who are affected. Bok wrote of the dissatisfaction of these kinds of acts as the society has been trying to fight such acts for a long time. He goes ahead and explains that the Supreme Court has responded against The First Amendment and thus, there should be freedom of speech in the colleges. He explains also that, although many communities would want to prohibit these kinds of actions for their aesthetic values, there should be no selective arbitration in prohibiting such things. For instance, America comprises of the black people and the white people and thus there should be no favor of a certain race but understanding. Now, this understanding is said to be brought about by discussions and freedom to listen, care and think of the other person as just like the other. Aesthetic value to this case refers to a situation that would make one avoid defacement of the building, as well as protecting the public from unnecessary noise (Cliteur).

According to my opinion, censoring or prohibiting certain kind of communication can be detrimental since it is difficult to demonstrate or tell which speech is offensive for prohibition. This means it would be not easy for one to weigh the point of offensiveness over the potential communication value. This is due t the facts that if one decides to prohibit certain speeches, it would be difficult to tell the insults in some of the selected problems. For instance, calling a black man 'Nigga' sounds so abusive when it comes from a white person. However, listening to black people having a conversation and they are calling each other such a name would bring up another perspective of the offence (Lukianoff). Another example is seen with the

homosexuals. ' Queer' is understood as an offensive word when a common man or student calls a homosexual such a name, but think about it, lately the homosexual have their groups, which they refer to themselves as ' queer'. Therefore, there is confusion on who is supposed to prosecute who if the freedom of speech s prohibited. Through this then, it would bring a lot of confusion which can turn communities inhumane and non-caring when they restrict what the members are supposed to say or express themselves. The situation would lead to offenders or the worst hate speakers in finding other ways of insulting and irritating the student and the society outside the institution (Magee).

Again, if some of the words or a certain kind of speech is said to be abusive or offensive it might trigger certain kind of attraction from the public making it be more used than the other clean speeches. This situation would be worse when it gets to the students in colleges. Therefore, according to my understanding restricting certain types of speech or word usage would lead to the majority of people trying to test the limits; thus a lot of time could be wasted as people would be trying to respond to tenuous distinctions thus, the result drawing more attention to the restricted words and in particular the offensive ones.

Before people embark on the censorship of certain speeches, it would be necessary to understand what it means. Speech codes are referred to as content based word or speeches while censorship is a situation where some information is limited for public opinion or rather the majority. This would be a response to denying or cutting some information from reaching the public thus, making information private. These are certain informations such as

offensive words, hate speech or pornography. Offensive, in our case, refers to words or speech that would irritate another party. It should be differentiated from abusive words, which refer to derogative language meant to instigate fight and hatred. In conclusion, it should be understood just as Socratic ideas postulate the power to questioning to be part of the First Amendment which does not support the freedom of speech and self expression.

In rebuttal to un-restricting speech in the universities and colleges, some directions to freedom of speech are dangerous to the students. For instance, the freedom of speech can be abusive and offending when it comes to the minority. For instance, racial segregation might lead to poor performance in the colleges for the minority. The feeling of segregation from the other people to those abused might also lead to drop outs from colleges due to constant abuse. This could only be protected by the law where it should take care of the conflicts within the people. Therefore, students have the right to receive equal education in all condition and thus while some are being abused it would lead to favor on one side.

Again, according to the New Hampshire and Chaplinsky, the two came clearly in supporting The First Amendment where they explain that if people or students, get into face to face insults, assaultive speeches or catcalls aiming at a small group of people or an individual they happen to be violating The First Amendment fighting words. These words are not supposed to be used and are prohibited as they might bring about conflicts and fight among people. There are also those certain verbal words that regulate workers at their workplace, and in that case, they are supposed to apply

even at the colleges. Therefore, just like a worker is supposed to work freely in his or her workplace without harassment, same thing should apply to the students in the universities and colleges (Hensley).

Again, free speech from someone can stop or prohibit the other party the freedom of speech, as well. The minority is at the disadvantage when it comes to this point. Therefore, some speech should be prohibited for the minority to get a chance of expressing their grievance.

In conclusion, colleges and universities should not restrict speech of the students. Living in the world of different races and different characters, the institution needs to listen to the grievances of both parties. It would be those differences that would bring understanding and tolerance for the races. If the problem is skin color people need to tolerate that and live like there is no much difference among them, restricting some words or speech can lead to test limits that would make many people try to use the insulting words. By restricting certain speeches in the colleges would make the abusers think of a new way of using such words thus increase the results. Unrestricted speech would make the running of the college easier and better since the instructors would obey the students and the dean would as well get a chance of correcting the instructors.

Works Cited

Brewer, Scott. Precedents, Statutes, and Analysis of Legal Concepts:

Interpretation. New York:

Routledge, 2013. Print.

Cliteur, Paul. The Secular Outlook: In Defense of Moral and Political

Secularism. New York:

John Wiley & Sons, 2010. Print.

Cover, Front. Speak No Evil: The Triumph of Hate Speech Regulation.

Chicago: University of

Chicago Press, 2010. Print.

Golding, Martin Philip. Free Speech on Campus. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield,, 2000. Print.

Hensley, Thomas R. The Boundaries of Freedom of Expression & Order in American

Democracy. Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2001. Print.

Lukianoff, Greg. Unlearning Liberty: Campus Censorship and the End of American Debate.

New York: Encounter Books,, 2013. Print.

Magee, James J. Freedom of Expression. Portsmouth: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002. Print.

Marcus, Laurence R. Fighting Words: The Politics of Hateful Speech.

Portsmouth: Greenwood

Publishing Group, 1996. Print.

O'Byrne, Darren J. Human rights: an introduction. London: Longman, 2003. Print.

Smolla, Rodney A. The Constitution Goes to College: Five Constitutional Ideas that Have

Shaped the American University. New York: NYU Press, 2011. Print.