**Week 8: Position Paper**

By Harsh Sharma

The real question is shall we stop talking about something in particular if it’s bad? I think not. If we pull a curtain onto something that doesn’t disappear the thing itself but merely hides it. So should PFW Ban Suggestive Videos, Written Documents, and/or Speaking Engagements if the content leads to Poor Behavior? No.

If PFW stops any content which may lead to poor behavior, then what the university is doing is providing the student a colored glass. As students we should not be biased towards one thing while making our own decisions. Not exposing students to the whole picture isn’t the ideal condition. Because it doesn’t allow the student to completely understand the picture of the real world. The university can’t stop what goes outside of the classroom, and therefore if the students don’t know what the other side of coin is, they may lack the ability to navigate in the real world.

If there is bad behavior, we need to address it. As a university, they are responsible to propagate the right message, not just **good**. And bad is just the other side of good. And the right decision can only be made when a person knows about both sides of the coin.

Also, not talking about a certain topic merely empowers it. Let’s take an example of AIDS. It’s a disease which is obviously transmitted through unprotected sexual intercourse. Now, this is a topic which is now properly communicated through but going back the years people weren’t as much comfortable. Now if we didn’t communicate it as freely then it very much be possible that more people would have been infected by it.

Especially in the world of the internet, is it actually possible to hide anything? I mean if you could question it, there is an answer for it on the net [1]. By PFW not explicitly talking about a particular behavior or a thing does not necessarily hide it from the students. But rather if they talk about it, the teachers could also address the problem and show how to address it. Which brings me to the topic of teaching hindrance.

Teachers and faculties should be allowed to experiment with controversial topics. Banning certain materials or discussions can hinder academic freedom and the pursuit of knowledge [2]. Some may find the topics to be not suitable but it’s a necessary sacrifice for new discovery, especially for the student. As they will be exposed to new viewpoints and develop their critical thinking [3].

Also, restricting certain ideologies bags the question of freedom of speech. A university is a place where students come to grow and learn, and therefore it’s expected that PFW provides a suitable environment where each ideology could be shared without any hindrance. Moreover, imposing ban on certain ideologies also breaks the right of freedom of speech which is a right of every citizen [4].
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