**Negative**

I Negate the following resolution, Resolved: The "right to be forgotten" from Internet searches ought to be a civil right.

**Definitions**

* The “Right to be Forgotten” is the right- under certain conditions - to ask search engines to remove links with personal information about them. This applies where the information is inaccurate, inadequate, irrelevant or excessive for the purposes of the data processing as defined by the European Union Court as of May 13th 2014.
* “Ought” is used to describe logical consequence as defined by Merriam Webster Dictionary.
* A “Civil Right” is a right that everyone should have regardless of race, sex, or religion as defined by Merriam Webster Dictionary.

**My Value is Liberty**

Liberty is the combination of Justice and Freedom. Freedom is key to a just and fair society and Justice can only be served when the rights of the people are being protected. The right to be forgotten directly conflicts with freedom of speech and is therefore unjust. For this reason you I urge you to negate.

**My Value Criterion is Freedom of Speech**

Right to be forgotten violates the people’s right to speak freely and express themelves’. If slanderous speech were to be erased from the internet then no one would be free to voice their opinion or express themselves, which would all undermine the idea of a free and open forum which is exactly what the internet is supposed to be. The Right to be forgotten attempts to censor public opinions and expressions which is simply unjust.

**Contention One: The Right to be Forgotten is censorship.**

When you erase the expressions of people and delete what they say or post online you are not only violating their rights, but also the rights of everyone else. The internet is a place where people can share infinite amounts of information with each other, and by removing said information; you are limiting people’s right to see that information. People have the right to learn and discover on the internet. When the government takes away this right, they are preventing people from partaking in the exchange that the internet was created for. Why should the government get to regulate the flow of information? Even if a person is upset by something on the internet that is negatively impacting them, it’s sad, but THEY put themselves in that position most of the time, and should be held accountable. And people have the right to see negative information about people such as attacks on GMOs or bad Yelp reviews.

Rosen 12- New Republic: The proposed European regulation treats takedown requests for truthful information posted by others identically to takedown requests for photos I’ve posted myself that have then been copied by others: Both are included in the definition of personal data as “any information relating” to me, regardless of its source. I can demand takedown, and the burden, once again, is on the social networking site or search engine to prove that it falls within the journalistic, artistic, or literary exception. This could transform Google, Yahoo, and other hosts of third party content into censors-in-chief for the European Union, rather than neutral platforms. It’s hard to imagine the Internet that results will be as free and open as it is now.

**Contention Two: Freedom of Speech is a civil right that cannot be undermined.**

 Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that, “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.”

Freedom of Speech is recognized around the world and is considered one of the most important rights to have in order to uphold justice and avoid oppression. When this is violated and unjustly stolen from people, you are effectively tyrannizing them. Freedom of speech is a civil right already! It has already been determined that Freedom of speech is a right reserved for the people. Since the resolution address civil rights we must look to the civil rights already established.

And Civil rights cannot violate other civil rights: Violating freedom of speech, a civil right, in order to input another civil right, makes no logical sense. It creates a paradox that says that sure, we can express ourselves, but not really as that expression can be taken away. It is understandable to limit freedom of speech when it is against the law (cases of national security, etc.), but to create a right that only serves to destroy another right, it unnecessary and unjust.

**Contention Three: Right to be Forgotten isn’t a necessity and won’t be effective.**

 According to Jo Best from ZDnet in 2014, a UK based news station: Yet, for many people, Google is the gatekeeper of the web — their first and last stop in finding information. The infamous 10 blue .links will largely be the only things a user sees when they're looking for any given piece of information online. If Google stops returning particular links in its search results, that means a great section of the online population won't ever see them. But those decisions are ones it makes already — by consigning a particular website to the fifth page of results, it's censoring much in the same way as removing it under a right to be forgotten request.

 Not only is the Right to be Forgotten not a necessity, it also will not be effective according to Jo Best from 2014: And with 41,000 requests already made and more to come, that's a lot of due consideration. It's difficult to see how Google could deal with thousands of requests seriously without extra resources — even if each request takes only an hour to deal with, Google would still need a team of 20 people working full time for a year to deal with the 41,000 requests it's already received. There is no word yet on who these new or existing staff — who will be making the decisions every day on how that tricky balance between the right to know and the right to be forgotten should be struck for individuals — will be.

Additionally, there will be push-back from search engines; Emma Woollacott from Forbes in 2014 points out that: There’s a distinct lack of clarity about the ruling, which will likely lead to more legal disputes. However, the EU is currently debating a new EU General Data Protection Regulation that will replace the current directive, extending the territorial reach of EU data protection laws to make it clear that they apply no matter where EU residents’ personal data is collected. Companies need to be prepared.