

Quin'darius Lyles-Woods

Rachel Foster

September 9, 2019

Assignment One

Example of Free Speech in Computing

Count on Trump to defend free speech from global censorship

Within the article “Count on Trump to defend free speech from global censorship” The Hill praises Trump's efforts to maintain freedom of speech online while many other European leaders are turning to censorship of its people. Personally, I think this a good move. Not a huge Trump supporter but I do appreciate him standing up for free speech during the group of seven at the G-7 conference. In the article it does say that he was fighting for a right that a lot of conservatives were fighting for online back home in the United States. One can say that he was simply protecting his own but still it inadvertently protects a very crucial human right so I can get behind it.

What this article brings to the surface is the question when do we limit what is said if what is being said is spewing hate. Do we simply let it grow and let them have their spaces online? Do we just wait and hope that common sense prevails? I think that free speech should continue to be allowed online. This is for a plethora of reasons; the right answer will always prevail, life can be governed on what a central body, if there is a central body then too easily can they be swayed with current politics. Eventually, the right answers will raise because the wrong way of thinking will lead to the destruction of society, while however painful will cause us to take a shift from the way of doing things so free speech should not be capped because someone thinks it's right, we don't even know if the body that would be censoring free speech's ideas are right.

All in all, I think that the position to keep speech free online should be kept, while at times this will be a painful experience seeing a lot of hate form from it, I believe that not having the censorship of the government online will provide dividends in innovation within the United States.

What I learned in the article was to the extent that other European countries monitor their people. This had made many of the citizen break out in protest over these laws.

The Fight Over Section 230—and the Internet as We Know It

Within the article “The Fight Over Section 230 - and the Internet as We Know It” Wired Magazine goes through Section 230 of the 1996 Communications Decency Act. They state that in the age of mass shooting that it is imperative to censor Americans actions online is a hard one to pass. They state that we live in a different age and needs laws that coincide with how society is right now. What is also being said is that they don’t want social media giants being the ones to facilitate this censorship and would rather a different entity allow this type of censorship.

My thoughts on this article is that you cant really have this to happen at all and I will explain my reason in the law of logic laws of if P then Q. For the statement if P then Q in logic laws the truth table states that they only time the statement is false is when the Q is negative. Q being the resulting effect of the if P. Thus the if P doesn’t really matter, so the question of the resulting mass shooting isn’t censorship or any other variable because the people would find a way around that and do it anyways. With the same notion you can sway public consensus through controlling what people see online but imagine the amount of distrust that the people will have when they will be censored. That will arguably cause for even more animosity than that of which is causing the current mass shooting. Alas only the future will tell what the correct decisions are but I think we should allow for good thoughts to natural rise instead of trying to suppress the bad ones.

The things that I learned from the article is the Communication Act of 1996 and how big section 230 is and how much it affects. Section 230 deals with whether a company is showing bias towards a specific group of people and protects the company if they are in a sense.