

HP, I ...

Brainstorming

No.

• The freedom to swing my hand stops where your nose begins. Justice power.

Society ^{hurts} → riots, sentiments of community → could lead to riots.
against Morality. abuse. Hobbes, Roosen, John Locke.
philosophy
social contract.
hate speech.

State → propaganda → penra. , weak state. , revolutions
State wit challenge surprising
emergence of situations (suspension). false
American embassy
attack 1979

Tech → blasphemy content, Immoral material, Challenge
traditional structure, Diverse populations hurt
Globalised world. cultures/taboos

• Please give some tips on brainstorming
and enhancing my outline at the end.
Thanks:

Is Freedom Of Speech an Absolute Right?

Outline:

1. Introduction:

- i. Hook statement.
- ii. General statement.
- iii. Thesis statement.

2. Societal Impacts of freedom of speech:

- i. absolute expression could hurt community sentiment.
- ii. absolute freedom is against Morality.
- iii. this totalness can cause chaos.

3. Impacts of absolute freedom on Technology:

- i. Sharing of blasphemous content: Dr Shah Nawaz case.
- ii. posting immoral material.
- iii. Trans-national impacts of absolute right of speech.

4. Cultural implications of absolute speech rights.

- i. Globalised world and hate speech.
- ii. not Respecting diverse populations.
- iii. hurting cultural tourism with absolute freedom.

5. Effects on State:

- i. Risk of propaganda
- ii. uprising because of this absoluteness.

iii Emergencies and freedom of speech.

6. Philosophical dimension of absoluteness.

i. Hobbes's perspective and Leviathan.

ii. John Lock and his Social contract.

iii. I. J. Rossen and not absolute freedom of speech.

iv. against the universal concept of Rights and Duties.

7. This absolute freedom right derstate the actual speech right.

i. Destablises democratic institutions.

ii. Fear of authoritarianism and suppression of dissent.

8. Conclusion:

Introduction:

Is freedom of speech an absolute Right? No. Although freedom of speech is a right. But, Absolute right, it is not. Justice Powell, the famous justice of UK, quotes: "The freedom to swing my arm stops where your nose begins". In this same manner freedom of speech, although a right, but not absolute. The Society we live in is diverse with multicultural, political, economical and religious aspects. This absolute freedom can hurt the sentiments of many, if granted to people. A man expressing his absolute speech rights could stand at the center of the city and speak whatever he likes, no matter how much immoral or abusive it is. This absoluteness will also target minorities and their opinions, cultures, if granted. This absolute speech goes against the concept of 'Rights and Duties'. If freedom of speech is right of someone, then it is ^{his} duty to not speak hate against other. Not only Society, this absoluteness will also target the state structure in the form of propaganda, riots, challenging the writ of state. This freedom, in this highly connected world, will go on to share blasphemous content, hate speech against divers cultures of the world. As the saying goes, absolute power corrupts absolutely, in the same manner, freedom of speech as a right should be given to everyone but not absolutely to protect the structure of Society from its grave consequences and harmful impacts. One of the foremost impacts, the absolute right of free speech will be upon the Society we live in.

The absolute freedom of speech means a person speaking his heart, lungs and liver out. He speaks whatever he likes, whenever he likes, however he likes. In this modern globalised world we are surrounded by multiple socially, culturally and religiously diverse populations. Everyone with their own beliefs, ideas and thoughts. This absolute freedom will hurt the sentiments of a lot of people of these diverse communities. A person can target ~~any~~ any ethnicity, religion and culture freely and when he is stopped by others, he will express his absolute right to speak. This absoluteness of freedom of expression is not just against societal harmony but also against morality. Total freedom means to speak whatever man likes, either it is a good word or a bad word, without any boundaries. Socrates was also given poison to drink because of his total freedom to speak and question. Athens believed that this freedom of absoluteness is against the structure of society and destructive. This totalness will also lead to chaos. In the British era, the Indian subcontinent saw this chaos, where Muslims and Hindus speaking against each other led to many riots, killing thousands from both sides. This uncontrolled freedom to speak sowed the seeds of hatred among both communities that they still can not live in harmony. To conclude, the absolute right to speak is detrimental to the structure of society.

One more impact, this freedom of speech as an absolute right will be upon the modern media and

Technology. The world has advanced and connected different and diverse communities through media and technology. This media and technological platforms can be used to target sentiments of different communities.

People can post whatever they think is right and is against the beliefs of other communities. This has been seen on social media specially, where one community shares blasphemous material to target others. Muslims have been repeatedly targeted in this manner that a person exercising his absolute freedom of speech right share cartoons or images of dignified personalities among muslims. While media and technology have advanced the human limits to gain information, the same has also increased events of sectarian conflicts among Muslims. A religious preacher of one community expressing his freedom of speech without respecting the emotions of other communities has many times fuelled the fire among different sects leading to violence. On this same media and technology, people's absolute freedom has lead them to share immoral content without giving a second thought to the idea that these platforms are also used by childrens. This immoral content sharing is his absolute right which should be curtailed and some boundaries created. To conclude, the freedom of speech as an absolute right is dangerous and has harmful impacts on technology and Media.

Moving on, one other major impact of absolute freedom of tongue is on the diverse world,

we live in. The world, in the present, has globalised. Boundaries of state have become illusions. The world has moved towards a global government. It is very hard to find isolated cultures in most of parts of the world.

This absolute form of freedom of speech will target these different communities, their cultures and traditions. This much freedom will lead to hate speech. Without any restrictions, the absolute tongue will not respect the diversity and will speak against the practices of many.

As the brain is connected to the tongue and the same brain accepts only one idea or belief and always thinks Urmensch of the other ideas and this bitterness of the brain will definitely show up on tongue, if not restricted.

Moreover, the culture of the modern has transformed into sustainable cultural tourism. In this tourism, the tourists

has to respect the environment through sustainable practices and the culture of indigenous population. The Absolute freedom can harm many among these communities.

To conclude, without lines drawn, the absolute freedom will significantly hurt the diversity of this world.

Furthermore, the absolute freedom of right will have grave implications for the state. This absolute freedom without some useful restrictions can lead to rise of propaganda. Not just the harmful elements within the state but also other states will exploit this notion by spreading false news, angering communities, leading to uprisings against the state. In 1979, the people of Pakistan took over to roads, when they heard that the US had

seized the Kabba. This propaganda took lives of two Americans and destruction of US embassy. These false news shared on the principle of absolute freedom with intentions to harm the state, harms the state.

Also, State has its own compulsions. During times of crisis such as war or emergencies, it is necessary to restrict speech for the same purposes discussed above. Hence, it proves that the freedom of speech can not be an absolute right of an individual as many a times it can come against the interests of the state.

Even philosophically, the absolute right of an individual to speak what he likes is seemed dangerous.

Thomas Hobbes, the great philosopher and one of the fathers of theory of social contract, says, that society before a social contract was in the state of "war of all against all" because of absolute freedom without any restrictions. This absolute freedom of everything produced a civil war like situation.

Similarly, John Lock, the proponent of 'Liberty, prosperity and the pursuit of happiness', in his work mandates that a state is necessary to put some restrictions upon its disciples to save life, property and prosperity of others. Even, Rousseau, the great romantic philosopher, has condemned the absoluteness of anything and everything because it leads to the destruction of society. He elaborates in his works that it is necessary to have limitations ~~of~~ over one's freedom so they can not curb the freedom of others. Going on, the concept of rights and duties teaches the same thing. If one has the right to speak,

it is his duty to not speak evil against other. Because this evil speech, given by absolute freedom, can harm the structure of society and create war like situations where one tongue, belief, and hand will fight the other, only on the basis of absoluteness. This said, the absolute freedom should have some restrictions to preserve the structure of society.

Moreover, this absolute freedom of speech is not only itself harmful but also dangerous for the actual freedom of speech with limits. This absoluteness gives state a cause to limit or even end the actual speech rights. This absoluteness also destabilises democratic institutions which are inclusive, and minority respecting. In 2010, ~~Atia~~ Shree Rehman, Minister of Pakistan's federal government gave recommendation to amend the blasphemous laws of the country, because they were used wrongly by the culprits and innocent people were getting killed. ~~Nothing happened~~ No reforms took place even at the end she had to ask for forgiveness to save her life. Because these laws have been sensitized by the clerics so much through their absolute freedom that no one dares to speak over them, harming later's speech rights. This absoluteness if used by state institutions give rise to authoritarianism and totalitarianism leading to persecution of opposition and suppression of dissent. This total government is not only harmful to its people but also to the world. Hitler and Mussolini are prime examples of the absolute freedom rights to state in the modern world. To conclude, it proves that the

absolute speech rights are dangerous and harmful to rights of speech with limits.

Conclusively, one may say that, the right to speak should be granted to everyone while the absolute right to speak should be granted to no one, not even the state, for the fear that it can lead to minority persecution, dissent & suppression, spread of immorality, rise of propaganda, and can lead to chaos like situation from which reversing back may require another world war and another Brettenwood system.

For Remarks & Improvement