

## Why Censorship by Secularist Social Media Voices is Utterly Irrational

Setting legalities aside, it must be said that whenever persons and such enterprises as Facebook, You-Tube, and Google, together with far-left-of-center “alphabet” news media in general (SSMV), rush to censor views they find objectionable (instead of rebutting or refuting it) they only expose their own **deep-seated cowardice**. Not only does this put them in stark conflict with the “free-speech” banner-movement of the 1960’s. In addition to betraying their own intellectual insecurities, their suppression of “the opposition” inadvertently leads to their commission of core logical fallacies too, including:

“Begging the Question,” on account of their undermining that notion of standards which are logically required in order to *justify* imposing either imperatives or prohibitions onto other parties. In a court of law for example, it is legally-codified laws of a judge’s own domain which serve to direct and legitimate their rulings. Yet *secular*-minded cultures self-consciously deny legitimacy to *social* claims that are based on *moral* rightness since they dismiss as illusory the very philosophical conception of a *moral* grounds for discriminating between a choice of actions. This isn’t to say that secularists totally lack any moral sense (every person has a functioning conscience, provided it isn’t seared). So, when secularists censor certain views as wrong, they cluelessly seek to retain their cake while eating it too.

“Employing a Double Standard” by contradicting the definition of their banner-word, “tolerate.” That term expresses openness to differing points of view, as opposed to pre-judging (prejudice) against other opinions, especially out of willful ignorance of any body of facts that they categorically shut out.

“The Fallacy of Exclusion” by their refusal to acknowledge, let alone confront and confute, evidence that they fear will undermine the validity of their own views. Further, and to their own detriment, this ploy deprives them of any conceivable way to demonstrate the alleged superiority of their view of reality. Instead their evasion leaves their own claims lying under a persisting cloud of suspicion.

They ignore the *scientific* method that they claim to champion. Secularists chronically fail to appreciate that the goal of investigations (either scientific or historical) is to, by means of a proposing a hypothesis (defined as an initial explanation made on the basis of limited evidence that is useful as a starting point for further investigation). The word literally means “a foundational thesis.” So insofar as SSMO merely seeks to silence the “opposition,” it cannot possibly advance social deliberation in a way that addresses social problems in a constructive manner.

The refusal to address highly consequential matters that is due to a lack of resolve to protect families and especially sexually-vulnerable children. To the extent that censorship is appropriate, at all, the SSMO is applying restrictions to the wrong category. Instead of suppressing certain points of view which clearly deserve to be included in the public debate, it should be censoring access to pornography in order to protect children. Deliberation over this concern is often sidelined on the grounds that the technical details necessary to bring this about are way too complex. This is not a credible objection. As we are already witnessing, SSMO eagerly censors intellectual matters. Yet the moral damage to children by internet pornography makes clear that censorship of pornography is the most urgent need of all.