

Free speech essay examples

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



Arguably, the existence of free speech in society relatively depends on its impacts. In many occasions, the debate on free speech has brought a lot of contentions, on whether there should be limits on free speech. As a matter of fact, free speech varies depending on the context that it was applied. The society we live in is very complex and diverse; hence, there should be limits to free speech. In a general perspective, free speech should not be an absolute, but rather be limited to certain reasons.

Conversably, the lives of people are very important, but the free speech can put all of them into risk. If the free speech poses a threat to the lives of people in a nation, then it should have limits. For example, some politicians and protestors call for public debates, but due to its direct offending the debates has been cancelled. Other scholars' belief that people should be allowed to publicly say what they think, despite the fact that it can destruct public order. This should not be the case, since the social, economic and political stability of a nation depends on the level of public order.

Globally, there is various evidence of racial attacks and violence that has been caused by politicians' freedom of speech. In this case, free speech among political allies in society can lead to drastic effects in society; therefore, there should be limits on free speech. One of the example is the Holocaust situation is one of real life situation in the globe.

Morals matter a lot in society, but in some occasions, the freedom of speech can endanger the moral standards of society. In this case, some individual have perfected on the art of speaking obscene things either on the media or public forums. In such a situation, limits to free speech should be introduced. This is because the limits will prevent children from being exposed to

immoral and extreme violent behaviors. On the same perspective, free speech should be limit or be regulated for the purpose of promoting democracy

Free speech has also caused more harm than good. In the year 2011, one of the religions claimed that the world was coming to an end. The person who passed this information enjoyed his freedom of speech, but due to that, a lot of people lost their lives and to others it destabilized their lives. In such an occasion, there should be limits on free speech. Individuals should be limited to free speech if they cannot justify what they say.

National security is a crucial aspect of a nation. This core issues in society has been compromised in some occasions by free speech. Therefore, the government and other stakeholders should restrict free speech for the interest of national security. For example, in the political arena politicians can use hate speech in the process of exercising their rights and freedom of speech. In such situations, free speech may bring the nation to a standstill, and finally threatening national security.

Free speech should have a limit, if it the speech has an imminent and clear danger of violence. There is a situation in society, whereby inflammatory speeches has lead to violence among different groups. As a matter of fact, the speeches could be challenged in a neutral platform, but it does not give room for verification. For example, there are nations in the world that have experienced various violent situations due to free speech.

Conclusively, freedom of speech is a fundamental and political right to express ones ideas and opinion through speech. The free speech should be limited in some occasions, especially if the free speech has an adverse

effect. People should enjoy free speech in politics, economic, and social life as right and freedom, but it should pose a risk to the public, individual or the nation. In a practical scenario, freedom of speech is not an absolute, meaning the government places limits to it on occasions such as slander, libel, incitement to committing a crime, as well as obscenity.