

Chapter 1 : The Labor Abuse That Went Into NYU's Abu Dhabi Campus | The Nation

These developments coincide with the growing antagonism toward freedom of speech at American universities, especially from the most politically assertive groups on campus.

Censorship is all around. The term freedom of expression is sometimes used synonymously, but includes any act of seeking, receiving and imparting information or ideas, regardless of the medium used. In practice, the right to freedom of speech is not absolute in any country and the right is commonly subject to limitations, as with libel, slander, obscenity, copyright violation and incitement to commit a crime. And once again, too much of the media is focusing attention on the use of the "n-word" and not on the speech itself: They argued that if black Americans do not want white Americans to continue referring to black Americans as niggers, then black Americans should stop allowing artists and record companies to use it. Essentially, the onus is on black Americans to prevent white Americans from using inflammatory, insulting language that has been used to oppress and demean black Americans since the beginning of the cross Atlantic slave trade. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be a social awareness or obligation to minimize hate or dangerous speech in American society concerning this discussion. This is about a group of youths gregariously chanting that those "niggers" should be hanging from trees. One usage expresses the support of murder, and one does not. This is how free speech transitions to hate speech and then to dangerous speech. America needs to start a debate between free, hate and dangerous speech. Internationally this discussion has progressed further than here. Internationally the focus has shifted towards dangerous speech, which is a form of hate speech that clearly correlates to negative outcomes. New Ideas for Genocide Prevention , says that "by teaching people to view other human beings as less than human, and as mortal threats, thought leaders can make atrocities seem acceptable -- and even necessary, as a form of collective self-defense. The hate speech used in these countries directly correlated to the commission of atrocities, and this discussion of dangerous speech could be beneficial in the United States. As a nation, America has tried to progress from the horrors of slavery, Jim Crow, lynchings and racial inequality while maintaining noble principles of free speech. Even now, the rather tepid addition of hate crime legislation constantly meets with resistance from many conservative lawmakers and parts of society. They argue a crime is a crime no matter its motives, and justice must be evenly meted by law enforcement. Coincidentally, the Department of Justice has just published its report finding that the Ferguson police department -- and one would imagine many others in the country -- is dangerously biased in its policing and treatment of its black citizens. It makes one wonder if any of the cops charged with protecting black communities were ever members of an organization or community that was comfortable referring to black Americans as niggers? The fraternity scandal demonstrates how racist, oppressive and dangerous traditions are still alive and well, and may contribute to the continued oppression of minorities. As a society we must become more aware of the dangers that certain speech presents, and for the safety and well being of black Americans and other vulnerable citizens, we must explore more robust ways for distinguishing and punishing people for dangerous speech. Oklahoma University appears to agree with this position since they have expelled two of the students leading the inflammatory recital, and banned that chapter of SAE from the campus. However, the two expelled students and the remainder of the defunct chapter have now hired high-profile lawyer Stephen Jones and are considering legal action against Oklahoma University and its president David Boren over their "harsh" punishment and "tarnished" reputations. They argue that they are being unfairly labeled as racists and bigots, and that they do not deserve being "tarred and feathered" -- an interesting choice of words; especially, since the two students have since apologized for their actions through a letter prepared by their lawyer blaming intoxication for their actions. When has intoxication ever been an adequate excuse for abhorrent actions? But the discussion in America has not progressed to a point where it sees dangerous speech -- particularly racist incitement to violence -- as a crime. These arguments are either failing or not wanting to see the clear and present danger in their speech to black Americans. Countries

DOWNLOAD PDF DANGEROUS WORDS : FREEDOM OF THE PRESS ON CAMPUS

throughout Europe have seen the danger in certain hate speech and have created laws that punish racist incitement without compromising their democratic values on free speech. These laws protect Jewish and other minority residents and show that societies clearly value their safety and security in their countries. These laws have not prevented all acts of racism and violence from occurring, as the Charlie Hebdo attacks in France remind us, but they send the right message to vulnerable minorities and galvanize public and police support to prevent future atrocities. If the Oklahoma chant happened in, say, Germany and the n-word was replaced with a derogatory epithet for the Jewish people, and the method of murder was changed from lynching to something employed by the Nazis, the perpetrators would be in jail right now and few outside the extremist right would argue that an injustice was done. How can so many in American society condone this incitement as youthful indiscretion and even redirect blame away from the perpetrators to the people who have had to suffer the oppression inflicted by those who spew these vile words? America can learn something from the international community, where the legacy and dangers of certain types of speech are better understood. We too must find an effective way to monitor and forbid dangerous speech, without unjustly infringing upon freedom of speech. We should have started the discussion long ago.

DOWNLOAD PDF DANGEROUS WORDS : FREEDOM OF THE PRESS ON CAMPUS

Chapter 2 : The Consequences of Free Speech – JONATHAN TURLEY

Students on the campus of Harvard University in (Brian Snyder/Reuters) A new bill before the Senate would ensure First Amendment rights in our institutions of higher learning.

In *Tinker*, several students were suspended for wearing black armbands that protested against the Vietnam War. Fraser[edit] Main article: *Bethel School District v. Fraser* In *Fraser*, a high school student was disciplined following his speech to a school assembly at which he nominated a fellow student for a student elective office. The speech contained sexual innuendos, but not obscenities. The Supreme Court found that school officials could discipline the student. In doing so, it recognized that "the process of educating our youth for citizenship in public schools is not confined to books, the curriculum, and the civics class; schools must teach by example the shared values of a civilized social order". Recognizing that one of the important purposes of public education is to inculcate the habits and manners of civility as valued conducive both to happiness and to the practice of self-government, the Supreme Court emphasized that "consciously or otherwise, teachers—and indeed the older students—demonstrate the appropriate form of civil discourse and political expression by their conduct and deportment in and out of class". Schools have discretion to curtail not only obscene speech, but speech that is vulgar, lewd, indecent, or plainly offensive. *Kuhlmeier*[edit] Main article: *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier* The *Hazelwood School District* case applies the principles set forth in *Fraser* to curricular matters. School authorities and educators do not offend the First Amendment by exercising editorial control over the style and content of student speech in school-sponsored expressive activities so long as their actions are reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical concerns. *Frederick*[edit] Main article: *Frederick blends Fraser and Hazelwood, applying them to a school-sanctioned event or activity.* The banner was in plain view of other students. The high school principal seized the banner and suspended *Frederick* because the banner was perceived to advocate the use of illegal drugs. The Supreme Court held that a principal may, consistent with the First Amendment, restrict student speech at a school event, when that speech is reasonably viewed as promoting illegal drug use. School-specific factors[edit] The right of free speech is not itself absolute: Whether the speech, if allowed as part of a school activity or function, would be contrary to the basic educational mission of the school *Hazelwood v. Each* of these considerations has given rise to a separate mode of analysis, and in *Morse v. Frederick* the Court implied that any one of these may serve as an independent basis for restricting student speech. This is the question of speech which is offensive to prevailing community standards by reason of being vulgar, lewd, or indecent speech. *State College Area School District. In Bethel School District v. Fraser* , the Supreme Court recognized the special responsibility of the public schools to inculcate moral values and to teach students the boundaries of socially acceptable behavior. It therefore permitted a public school to discipline a student for making sexually suggestive remarks in an address to a school assembly, even though the remarks were not obscene in the traditional sense. The ability to regulate inappropriate speech has been found to be especially important in situations where the student speech may have the appearance of being sponsored or endorsed by the school. In such circumstances, the United States Supreme Court has found that student speech may be regulated. For example, in *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier* , it held that a school may exercise control over the content of a student newspaper when it attempts to address issues of divorce and teenage pregnancy; in *Morse v. Frederick* , it permitted a school to exercise control over the words displayed on a large banner at a school-sponsored event, when those words convey a message promoting the use of illegal drugs. Pure speech[edit] One of these factors is whether the activity sought to be controlled is " pure speech ", or sufficiently related to the expression of ideas to fall under the umbrella of the First Amendment. Focus of protected speech activity[edit] The focus of the protected speech activity, whether pure speech or not, may affect the propriety of regulation by school officials.

Chapter 3 : Threats to Freedom of the Press on Campus, - FIRE

International conference on Freedom of the Press in Stockholm October 1 at 12 pm to 6 pm- An international conference to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the Swedish Freedom of the Press Act The freedom to write and speak is best honoured by expressing important and sometimes dangerous thoughts.

The Consequences of Free Speech by Gene Howington, Guest Blogger On a recent thread , the topic of politically correct speech as it relates to free speech came up. As with many of the more interesting threads on this blog, the topic came about from meandering rather than the subject proper of the thread. The subject was brought back to fore in my mind this morning when I read this: It seems there are a lot of misconceptions about what constitutes free speech, the limitations thereon and the consequences thereof. The core of the American free speech right and tradition is codified in the 1st Amendment of the U. Congress shall make no law [. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Art. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. Let us consider these implications. What is free speech? You are free to think what you like and express your thoughts. The marketplace of ideas “ a consequence of freedom of speech “ relies upon this. However, that being said, there are some limitations on free speech that are universally accepted in domestic and international jurisprudence. Many countries also recognize sedition calling for the overthrow of government as unacceptable as well. Consider the difference in these prohibitions and the different ways of addressing the 1st Amendment: All three approaches allow for restrictions on free speech. The absolutist approach takes the stance that literally no law prohibiting speech is permissible. The categorical approach attempts to define what speech is or is not protected by assigning categories such as obscenity, fighting words, commercial speech and political speech. Most modern jurists adopt either the categorical or the balancing approach as the absolutist approach is impractical. Defamation and incitement have sound public policy behind them. It has nothing to do with your feelings being hurt. It is a very specific, very hard to prove tort where someone says things to or about someone with specific foreknowledge and the intent to cause the hearer or subject to suffer extreme emotional distress. It is a wilful tort and you must prove the speaker had mens rea guilty mind in causing the extreme emotional distress. Inciting panic or violence often ends up with innocent bystanders getting harmed either physically or by having their property destroyed and that is a matter of public safety as well as equity. In the United States, a particularly odd political crime too considering the express language of the Declaration of Independence. However, with these above noted exceptions, free speech means anything goes basically. You are allowed to think and express your thoughts. This carries some broader implications. As all people are free to express their thoughts and opinions, you are certainly going to hear things you disagree with or disapprove of or maybe even find insulting or offensive. That is simply a cost of the freedom. If you value free speech then you accept that you will be disagreed with, insulted and offended at some time. If you cannot accept this and try to oppress others simply for having a different, insulting or offensive opinion, then you miss the point of free speech. The antidote for different ideas, just as it is for offense or insult, is more free speech. Offer rejoinder for insult and offense. But everyone gets their say whether you personally like it or not. Even if the motive behind your thought is to crush an idea that is deeply offensive and indefensible. There is an idea, Mr. Creedy “ and ideas are bulletproof. This illustrates why the antidote to bad ideas and bad arguments is precisely more free speech “ better ideas, better arguments. Your feelings are not generally protected by law with the one exception in tort. They are your own reactions and you own them. They may or may not be rational. This is part and parcel of what is wrong with the idea of politically correct speech. An idea that has crept on to what was once the bastion of free speech “ American college campuses. As soon as you allow something as vague as Big Brother protecting your feelings, anything and everything can be punished. If this trend continues, our colleges and universities will become a global laughing stock. Free speech must be protected at

DOWNLOAD PDF DANGEROUS WORDS : FREEDOM OF THE PRESS ON CAMPUS

all costs. It is how we speak truth to power, to others and to ourselves when we are interested in learning truths. It can make you uncomfortable. It will challenge you. It will piss you off. It will hurt your feelings. It comes with costs. These are some of the costs that you pay for freedom of speech. James Madison thought freedom of speech and the press was critical and the 1st Amendment the most important item in the Bill of Rights. Maybe you should think about that too. What do you think?

Chapter 4 : Dangerous Words | Tryckfrihetsförordningen

"Introduction: the rise of patriotic correctness -- Academic freedom in America after 9/11 -- Censorship on campus of criticism of Israel -- David Horowitz's crusade for the \"academic bill of rights\" -- Biased numbers: counting Democrats and Republicans on campus -- Conservative correctness and free speech on campus -- What would Jesus censor?"

Chapter 5 : Press Freedom Under Attack in Colleges to Protect Campus Safe Spaces

If progressives are committed to protecting freedom of conscience and freedom of expression for women and minorities, then they need to protect free speech across the board.

Chapter 6 : Freedom Of Speech Quotes - BrainyQuote

The freedom of the press is being trampled to shelter adult students from the real world. Journalists who attempt to interview college students are being deprived of their First Amendment rights to maintain campus "safe spaces."

Chapter 7 : Dangerous Speech is Not Free Speech or Even Hate Speech | HuffPost

Campus=Freedom(?) essays One of the popular issues around these days is whether we let hate speech or not on campuses. It is a very sensitive subject and requires insightful approach.

Chapter 8 : School speech (First Amendment) - Wikipedia

According to a new report, for nearly a decade, the construction of the new campus systematically exposed workers to abuse and coercion.

Chapter 9 : How Colleges Suppress Freedom of the Press: Repression at Nassau Community College | AC

The result that got the most press (and criticism from skeptics) was in relation to the following question: A public university invites a very controversial speaker to an on-campus event.