

No need topic

[History](#)



Steve Herbet in ' The " Battle of Seattle" revisited' illustrates a situation where the demonstrations on the first day of the World Trade Organization forum interrupted the schedule meant to commence on November 29, 1999. The need for the protesters to register dissent with the World Trade Organization resulted in endless demonstrations. They interfered with the schedule by blocking traffic to downtown Seattle. Some protesters confronted the WTO delegates while others engaged in vandalism. In my opinion, the protesters' intent was to echo the state of oppression in terms of holding dissent. The constitution allows for peaceful demonstrations. However, it was improper for them to engage in acts of vandalism. The constitutional right to peaceful demonstration does not create a loophole where protesters engage in unlawful acts. The demonstrations compelled the City of Seattle to formulate " emergency orders." Order No. 3 was significant because it established a " restricted access" zone for the entire week. In my opinion, the orders were the best possible forms of obtaining a balance between the constitutional right of free speech and the need for a city to uphold order and security. The orders placed the interests of both the residents and the city into consideration; hence, the balance.

After reading the article, it is evident that is a constant battle between individuals trying to exercise their constitutional rights and the law enforcers trying to maintain order and security. As in the Seattle case, the protesters caught the police flat-footed, as they [the police] had not anticipated such protests. The battle to regain control of the " space" ensued in riots; hence, interrupting the first day of the WTO conference. In my opinion, the orders issued served to strike a balance between the protesters and law enforcers. However, the manner in which they were implemented would have

<https://assignbuster.com/no-need-topic/>

compromised normal activities in the city. I think the City of Seattle would have stipulated stringent measures to end the protests rather than keeping the protesters from the location of the conference. Various issues arose from such zoning. For example, in the city streets, innocent people are caught up in protests. Activities are halted in an attempt to stay safe. In such situations, the police view every civilian as partisan to the protests. Therefore, it would be better if the City of Seattle formulated harsh orders to end the riots. In addition, people would not protest without a reason. Instead of formulating controls for the space of protest, the City would have formulated controls for speech in such spaces. It is not prudent to push riots to one area in an attempt to regain space. I think the city police would have enforced measures to regulate the content of speech to ensure that there is no compromise to the freedom of movement. In my opinion, the orders, No. 3 specifically, interfered with everyone regardless of their participation in the protests because it restricted movement.

The Seattle case brings to light issues regarding the use of public space and the constitutional freedom of speech; hence the following questions:

Does the government offer citizens an equal chance to utilize public spaces and discuss political positions?

In addition, do the territorial restrictions offer a long-term solution to obtaining a balance between the right to hold peaceful demonstrations and the enforcers' responsibility for maintaining order and security?

The Seattle case is a vivid illustration of the conflict between the public to exercise their constitutional rights and the law enforcers to maintain harmony.