

Psy2000

perspectives on free-
speech zones on
college campuses

[Psychology](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Perspective on Free Speech Zone on College Campuses Perspective on Free Speech zone on College Campuses Free speech zones otherwise commonly known as the protest zone has been in practice for quite a period of time. They have been used for big events or during for political conventions. It refers to a designated place enacted by the government to control or to limit the action of the angry noisy protestors and even to minimize the damages that may result from the same. Every scholar or law makers has distinct arguments regarding the policies behind free speech zones. For instance, Greg Lukianoff argues that free speech should not be limited to certain portion of areas within the University. He says these undermines the students' right to freedom of expression and is not in support of freedom of speech in accordance to the law. He continues to say that all the entire campus should be a free speech zone. On the hand, Scot is in support of free speech zone pointing out clear that the government should impose time, place, and manner restrictions on speech (Pavela, 2008). In support, he says that this would minimize damages to business, and traffic blockages among other disorders. Scot made the strong point adhered to control the action of the protestors into one designate place. This brings issues related with the First Amendment.

The free speech zones are not in consistence with the First Amendment whereby they indeed violate it. Lukianoff strongly oppose the action of WVU to dictate places where students can meet and share their grievances saying that students should be allowed to talk anywhere because their right of freedom dictates so. Freedom of speech can be controlled at time in campuses especially when it can disrupt other university activities in one

way or another. Hate speech violates fundamental human right to enjoy the freedom of speech. The fundamental right should be restricted merely to avoid hate speech. In this case, hate speech should be highly controlled at various zones to fight off discrimination that can bring serious divisions. It is thus vital to have in place well formulated policies in campuses to check against these dangers.

The existing freedom of speech policy compares to a great extent with that of West Virginia University. The policies dictate the distinct places within the campus where students can hold regular meetings and rallies. Speech is also censored meaning that there is an element of no freedom to speech at all. The steps to change this situation should start from the administration where their duty is to protect and even facilitate the right to free speech as dictated by the constitution. If this cannot be upheld, then legal order should be instituted whereby the matter can be discussed in law court and a possible solution be arrived at (Boss, 2011).

Every university has a law or policy regarding code of conduct, which establishes or dictates behavioral standards pertaining to students, student organization, teaching staff, and the subordinate staffs (Pavela, 2008). These standards for instance guard against academic dishonesty, alcohol, false information, and sexual assaults among others. The policies have reasonable penalties and thus the University Council should set up a committee to make constructive investigations in the work Professor Churchill. The outcomes of the committee found Professor Churchill to be guilty of hate speech in his work and recommended that he should be dispelled from any public writing (Boss, 2011). This is despite the considerations from constitutional provision

of freedom of speech.

In this case, freedom of speech gives someone the liberty to express themselves whereby jeering is one of the ways in which one can articulate their dissatisfaction. It is vital to note that freedom of speech justifies jeering as it is a way of communication. Freedom of speech concerns passing of information or ideas regardless of the used medium. In every situation, there must be a counterchecking element and thus freedom of speech does not give one the right to intimidate others. Cyber-bullying is a crime and should not be confused with freedom of expression. In fact freedom of speech is categorical and considerate while cyber-bullying does not fall in freedom of speech. There the victims should be held accountable and even should be persecuted (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006).

References

- Pavela, G. (2008). Limiting the "Pursuit of Perfect Justice" on Campus: A Proposed Code of Student Conduct. *Journal of College and University Law*, 6(2), 137-60.
- Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth violence and juvenile justice*, 4(2), 148-169.
- Boss, J. (2011). *THiNK*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.