

# Index

## **ABORTION PROCEDURES**

Commercial speech, § **20:32.10**

## **ABORTION PROTEST**

Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, § **21:12.50**

Conduct prohibited

Generally, § **13:26**

Damage or destruction of property, § **13:28**

Force, threat of force, and physical obstruction, § **13:27**

Cybersquatting, § **21:12.50**

Floating vs. fixed buffer zones

McCullen ruling, § **13:38.50**

Schenck ruling, § **13:38**

Force, threat of force, physical obstruction, or damage to property

Generally, § **13:34**

Floating vs. fixed buffer zones, above

Illegal conduct regulation vs. content or viewpoint regulation, § **13:35**

Madsen v. Women's Health Center ruling, § **13:37**

R.A.V. and Mitchell rulings, § **13:36**

Freedom of Access to Clinic

Entrances Act of 1994: peaceful abortion protest is protected speech

Generally, §§ **13:24, 13:25, 13:31**

Conduct prohibited, above

Floating vs. fixed buffer zones, above

Force, threat of force, physical obstruction, or damage to property, above

Historical and cultural backdrop, below

## **ABORTION PROTEST—Cont'd**

Freedom of Access to Clinic

Entrances Act of 1994: peaceful abortion protest is protected speech—Cont'd

Intent to injure, intimidate, interfere, or damage, § **13:29**

McCullen v. Coakley, § **13:38.50**

Overbreadth issue, §§ **13:39, 13:40**

Provisions of the Act, §§ **13:25 to 13:29**

Remedies, § **13:30**

Use of force. Force, threat of force, physical obstruction, or damage to property, above

Vagueness issue, §§ **13:39, 13:41**

Historical and cultural backdrop

Generally, § **13:32**

Nonviolent, nonobstructing, nondestructive protest, § **13:33**

McCullen v. Coakley, § **13:38.50**

Picketing of clinics: Madsen decision, § **15:55**

Websites, § **21:12.50**

## **ABRAM v. UNITED STATES**

Holmes dissent in, repudiation of bad tendency concept and, § **10:8**

## **ABSOLUTISM**

Generally, §§ **2:10, 2:47**

Absolute principles embraced by First Amendment, § **2:54**

Absolutism rejected by Supreme Court, § **2:53**

As too simplistic

Generally, § **2:50**

First Amendment no immunity in all use of language, § **2:51**

Spurious speech/conduct distinction, § **2:52**

Legacies of Justices Black, and Douglas, § **2:48**

**ABSOLUTISM—Cont'd**

- Pentagon papers litigation and absolutist opinions of Justices Black and Douglas, § 15:17
- Rejected by Supreme Court, § 2:53
- Rhetoric and reality among absolutists, § 2:49

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

- Faculty members' speech and academic freedom. See **Education**
- Privilege of academic researcher, § 17:38.60
- Racial harassment, § 17:38.50
- School newspapers, censorship, § 17:10.50
- Sexual harassment, § 17:38.50

**ACCESS**

- No general right of access to broadcasters, and content regulation of broadcasts since Red Lion in Democratic National Committee decision, § 26:9
- See also **Broadcast Regulation**
- Special First Amendment press protection in cases involving
  - Access by the press, § 22:16
  - Access to the press, § 22:17

**ACCIDENTS**

- Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by attorneys: thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, § 20:30

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

- Disciplining government employees for speech activity, defining speech of public concern: speech critical of office policy implicating questions of public accountability, § 18:12

**ACCOUNTANTS**

- Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by, § 20:34
- Edenfield v. Fane, § 20:35
- Ibanez decision, § 20:36

**ACCOUNTANTS—Cont'd**

- Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by, § 20:34—Cont'd
- Lower court decisions, § 20:37

**ACCREDITATION**

- Education, requirement challenges, § 17:44

**ACTION FOR CHILDREN'S TELEVISION DECISION**

- Obscenity and indecency: content regulation of broadcast and, § 26:26

**ACTIONS**

- Freedom of speech encompasses communication through symbols and actions other than the use of language, § 11:2

**ACTUAL MALICE STANDARD**

- Creation of First Amendment standards for libel, § 23:3

**ADARAND CONSTRUCTORS v. PENA**

- Benign use of racial speech by government and, overruling of Metro, § 13:22

**AD HOC BALANCING METHODOLOGY**

- Generally, §§ 2:11, 2:55
- Seductive appeal of ad hoc balancing, § 2:57
- Shortcomings of
  - Generally, § 2:58
  - Ad hoc balancing unfairly weighted in favor of legislative judgments, § 2:60
  - Low-predictive value chills free speech, § 2:59
- Supreme Court approach to ad hoc balancing, § 2:56

**ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE**

- Distinguishing between gag orders furthering, and orders protecting image of courts and judges, § 15:42

## INDEX

### ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION

- Vagueness and overbreadth and standardless delegation of, § 6:2
- Standardless delegation or impermissibly broad grants of discretion, § 6:16

### ADULT ENTERTAINMENT

- Application of current obscenity standards to bookstores, § 14:37
- Closure of establishments, used for solicitation of prostitution or other illegal activity unrelated to content of expression, in applying current obscenity standards against pornography, § 14:55
- Prior restraints and current obscenity standards: use of informal pressure to censor adult material, § 14:62
- Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to sexually oriented bookstores, theatres, and dance clubs, § 9:21
- Use of zoning laws to regulate nonobscene, § 14:39

### ADVERSARY HEARING

- Procedural issues concerning prior restraints, see **Freedman v. Maryland**

### ADVERTISING

- Aerial advertising, as forums, § 8:18.10
- Application of commercial speech doctrines: truthful advertising of legal activities, § 20:18
- Campaign advertising disclosure laws, § 16:39
- Government using speech regulation to discourage interstate lottery, § 19:26
- Johanns decision, §§ 4:27.60, 19:25.50, 20:45.60
- Pop-ups, § 27:26
- Professional directories, § 20:31.40
- Refusals to accept, school activities and, § 17:12
- Regulation of elections and political processes: campaigns, primaries,

### ADVERTISING—Cont'd

- elections, and parties, false political advertising, § 16:32.30
- United Foods case, generic advertising outside of regulated industries, § 20:45.50

### AESTHETIC PURPOSES

- Commercial speech in context of regulation for, § 20:38
- Aesthetic and environmental concerns as substantial state interests, § 20:39
- “Do not call” list controversy, § 20:40.50
- Singling out commercial speech: Metromedia and Discovery Network, § 20:41
- Telemarketing, § 20:40

### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

- Governmental use of racial speech and, see **Government**

### AGE

- Student speech, university distinguished from secondary and pre-secondary students, § 17:2.50

### AIRSPACE ABOVE BEACHES

- As forums, § 8:18.10

### ALEXANDER DECISION

- Prior restraints in obscenity cases: application of current obscenity standards in attempts to ban pornography, forfeitures under RICO provisions in the, § 14:61

### ANTIMASK LEGISLATION

- Case study in determining content neutrality in context of symbolic speech, § 11:25

### ANTITRUST LAWS

- Press and, §§ 22:21, 22:22

### APPEARANCE

- School regulation of, see **Education**
- Voter apparel, buttons, or insignias, restrictions on, polling places, § 16:31.10

**APPELLATE REVIEW PRINCIPLE**

Roth and independent, § 14:16

**APPROPRIATION (THE RIGHT OF PUBLICITY)**

First Amendment and privacy, § 24:4

Prior restraint, §§ 15:58.30, 15:58.70

**ARCADES**

Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to sexually oriented, § 9:21

**ARIZONA FREE ENTERPRISE CLUB'S FREEDOM CLUB PAC v. BENNETT**

Public matching funds to level the playing field, § 16:21.50

**ARTS**

Funding of, by government, see **Funding the Arts**

Government as librarian, curator, and arts impresario, §§ 19:15 to 19:20, 19:23

**ASHCROFT v. ACLU**

Obscene (and pornographic) speech, community standards and internet, § 14:66

**ASSEMBLY**

Brandenburg standard and unlawful assembly, § 10:36.60

Reinforcing power of right of, § 16:3

**ASSOCIATION**

Education and problem of forcing inclusion, § 17:41

Membership eligibility discrimination by student groups, § 17:42

Reinforcing power of right of, § 16:3

**ATTORNEYS**

Bar admission regulations, § 20:27.50

Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by Generally, § 20:28

Ohralik and Primus decisions, § 20:29

**ATTORNEYS—Cont'd**

Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by —Cont'd

Regulation of lawyer blogs, § 20:31.30

Specialty advertising, § 20:31

Thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, § 20:30

Directories that sell advertising, § 20:31.40

Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press, disciplinary proceedings, § 25:43.50

Judicial proceedings and gag orders Generally, § 15:45

Lower court decisions on attorney gag orders, § 15:45

Restrictions on books written by attorneys on their cases, § 15:46

Professional directories that sell advertising, § 20:31.40

**AUTOMATION**

Telemarketing restrictions on political calls and recorded messages, § 16:41

**AUTOPSY PHOTOGRAPHS**

Privacy (and related torts), § 24:6.50

**AVERTING EYES**

See **Captive Audience**

**BAD TENDENCY CONCEPT**

Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of, § 10:7

Brandeis opinion in Whitney, § 10:13

Holmes dissent in Abrams v. United States, § 10:8

Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of “bad tendency” in Gitlow decision

Generally, § 10:9

Applying First Amendment to the states, § 10:10

## INDEX

### **BAD TENDENCY CONCEPT**

#### **—Cont'd**

Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of “bad tendency” in *Gitlow* decision

#### **—Cont'd**

Deferring to legislative determinations that clear and present danger exists, § 10:11

Holmes and Brandeis dissents, § 10:12

In *Schenck* decision, § 10:4

### **BALLOTS**

Disclosure, § 16:31.50

Regulation of elections and access to, racial exclusions, § 16:26

Regulation of elections and restrictions on access to, § 16:27

### **BANKRUPTCY AND DEBT RELIEF**

Commercial speech in context of professional services, § 20:31.50

### **BANS**

Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by attorneys: thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, § 20:30

First Amendment ban on discrimination among different media, § 22:19

Smoking ban, application of modern symbolic speech principles, § 11:23.60

### **BARNTICKI v. VOPPER**

Illegal interception of electronic material, § 25:45.50

Trafficking in truthful information, § 25:45.60

### **BEAUHARNAIS DECISION**

First Amendment principles governing regulation of: historical background of group libel and, § 12:6

Analysis of *Beauharnais*, § 12:7

*Beauharnais* and outmoded categorical approach to First

### **BEAUHARNAIS DECISION**

#### **—Cont'd**

First Amendment principles governing regulation of: historical background of group libel and, § 12:6—Cont'd

Amendment jurisprudence, § 12:9

Group libel, infliction of emotional distress, and individual libel compared, § 12:8

### **BEEF CHECKOFF PROGRAM**

*Johanns* decision

Compelled speech, § 19:25.50

Government speech, §§ 4:27.60, 20:45.60

### **BELOTTI DECISION**

Regulation of corporate political speech, § 16:16

### **BILL OF RIGHTS**

Adoption of, § 1:7

Relevance of federalism, § 1:9

Restatement or rebellion, § 1:8

### **BIVENS DECISION**

Purposeful discrimination, content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, § 3:6.40

### **BLOCKING**

Unwanted mail, see **Mail**

### **BOARD OF TRUSTEES v. FOX**

Evolution of commercial speech doctrine: refinement in, § 20:7

### **BOND DECISION**

Intent and imminence standard in *Brandenburg* and, § 10:22

### **BONG HITS 4 JESUS DECISION**

School-sanctioned events, *Morse v. Frederick*, § 17:4.50

### **BOOKSTORES**

Application of current obscenity standards to adult, § 14:37

Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to sexually oriented, § 9:21

**BORDER SEARCHES**

Clear and present danger, § 10:20.60

**BRANDENBURG v. OHIO**

Clear and present danger and, see  
**Clear and Present Danger Test**  
 Relevance of, to regulation of hate  
 speech, § 12:10

**BRANTI v. FINKEL**

Political speech and government  
 employees: patronage cases,  
 § 16:6

**BRANZBURG v. HAYES**

Reporter's privilege: ambiguous rul-  
 ing in, § 25:19  
 Dissents, § 25:21  
 Majority opinion, § 25:20  
 Pivotal concurring opinion of  
 Justice Powell, § 25:22  
 Reporter's privilege: developments  
 since, § 25:23  
 Lower court s, § 25:26  
 Relevance of *Herbert v. Lando*,  
 § 25:24  
 University of Pennsylvania v.  
 EEOC dictum, § 25:25

**BREAKING NEWS**

Intellectual property, copyright  
 preemption, § 21:15

**BROADCASTING**

Blocking, see **Electronic Media**

**BROADCAST MODEL**

Access by the public to institutional  
 press: *Red Lion* decision,  
 § 25:48

**BROADCAST REGULATION**

Comparison of cable and, § 27:3  
 Constitutional framework, § 26:1  
 Constitutional foundations for  
 regulation, § 26:3  
 Tradition of regulation, § 26:2  
 Content regulation, § 26:4  
 Candidate access to televised  
 debates, § 26:16  
 Challenges to FCC's regulation of  
 "fleeting expletives" as

**BROADCAST REGULATION**

—Cont'd

Content regulation, § 26:4—Cont'd  
 indecency, § 26:28  
 Fairness doctrine and related  
 issues: *Red Lion* decision,  
 § 26:5  
 Public broadcasting, § 26:15  
 Summary: test for content-based  
 regulation distilled, § 26:27  
 Content regulation developments  
 since *Red Lion*, § 26:6  
 Fairness doctrine and administra-  
 tive and political roller  
 coaster after *Red Lion*,  
 § 26:10  
 Content regulation developments  
 since *Red Lion* in Democratic  
 National Committee decision,  
 § 26:7  
 No general right of access to  
 broadcasters, § 26:9  
 State action question, § 26:8  
 Content regulation of obscenity and  
 indecency, § 26:17  
 Action for Children's Television  
 litigation, § 26:26  
 Developments since *Sable*, § 26:25  
 Limits on *Pacifica*: *Sable* ruling,  
 § 26:24  
 Obscenity, § 26:18  
 Content regulation of obscenity and  
 indecency: indecency and  
*Pacifica* decision, § 26:19  
 Indecent but not obscene, § 26:20  
 "Influence on children" rationale,  
 § 26:23  
*Pacifica* and reduced protection for  
 broadcasting, § 26:21  
 "Pervasiveness rationale," § 26:22  
 Content regulation of political  
 campaigns, § 26:11  
 Equal opportunities for access,  
 § 26:13  
 Equal opportunities for access:  
 absolute protection against  
 defamation liability, § 26:14  
 Reasonable access: *CBS, Inc. v.*  
*FCC* decision, § 26:12

## INDEX

### **BROADCAST TELEVISION**

Comparison of cable television to,  
§ 27:3

### **BROWN v. HARTLAGE**

Regulation of speech of candidates  
and lessons of, § 16:32

### **BUCKLEY v. VALEO**

Regulation of individual contribu-  
tions and expenditures, § 16:10

### **BULLYING**

Education, hostile environment,  
§ 17:17.50

### **BURSON v. FREEMAN**

Regulation of elections and restric-  
tions on activity near polling  
places, § 16:31

### **BUTTERWORTH v. SMITH**

Emerging principle of unauthorized  
disclosure of truthful informa-  
tion by the press: grand juries,  
§ 25:42

### **CABLE ACT OF 1992**

Generally, § 27:7  
Must-carry provisions, § 27:9  
Overview, § 27:8

### **CABLE TELEVISION**

Cable Act of 1992, see **Cable Act of 1992**

Computer encryption codes, § 27:24

Content-based regulation of, § 27:13

Attempts to regulate indecency,  
§ 27:14

Cable operators' self-imposed  
prohibitions on indecency,  
§ 27:15

Indecency scrambling and block-  
ing, § 27:14

Playboy Entertainment Group  
decision, § 27:14

Direct broadcast satellite (DBS),  
§ 27:16

FCC regulation of cable

Generally, § 27:5

Cable Act of 1992, see **Cable Act of 1992**

### **CABLE TELEVISION—Cont'd**

FCC regulation of cable—Cont'd

History, § 27:6

First Amendment standards: Turner  
Broadcasting decision, § 27:10

Turner II, § 27:11

Internet domain names, § 27:25

Other provisions of the Cable Act:  
the Time Warner litigation,  
§ 27:12

Understanding, § 27:1

Comparison of cable to broadcast  
television, § 27:3

Contemporary cable industry,  
§ 27:4

FCC regulation of cable, above

History of cable television, § 27:2

### **CAMERAS**

Newsgathering (First Amendment  
protection), public interest  
group's surveillance cameras,  
§ 25:16.50

### **CAMPAIGNS**

See **Elections; Political Campaigns**

### **CAMPING OR SLEEPING**

#### **OVERNIGHT IN PARKS AND PLAZAS**

Symbolic speech, issues posed by  
“Occupy Wall Street” and other  
“Occupy Movement”  
demonstrations, § 11:31

### **CANDIDATES**

Election, see **Elections**

Free speech, see **Political Process (and First Amendment)**

### **CAPTIVE AUDIENCE**

Cemeteries, limits on picketing and  
demonstrations, § 5:11.50

Funerals, limits on picketing and  
demonstrations, § 5:11.50

On government property

Generally, §§ 5:12 to 15:15

Lehman decision, § 5:14

Pollack decision, § 5:13

Reconciling Pollack and Lehman:  
making sense of captive audi-  
ence principle, § 5:15

**CAPTIVE AUDIENCE—Cont'd**

Prison regulations, § 5:16

Privacy in the home and, § 5:4

Blocking unwanted mail: when addressee initiates blocking, § 5:6

Blocking unwanted mail: when government initiates blocking, § 5:7

Home as refuge, § 5:5

Unwanted speech near the home: picketing and other expressions in residential neighborhoods, § 5:11

Privacy in the home and: blocking broadcasting and other electronic media entering the home, § 5:8

Other electronic media: implications of Sable decision, § 5:10

Pacifica ruling and related issue of sheltering children from offensive speech, § 5:9

Problem of, § 5:1

General rule in open marketplace: burden on viewers to avert their eyes, § 5:2

Rationales for requiring offended viewers to avert their eyes, § 5:3

Whether offensive speech principles applicable in marketplace apply to speech in the workplace and concerns relating to, § 13:16

**CASINO GAMBLING**

Government using speech regulation to discourage: Posadas de Puerto Rico decision, § 20:20

**CATEGORICAL APPROACH**

Limited modern examples of, § 2:71

Outdatedness of Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire, § 2:70

**CAUSATION PRINCIPLE**

As core principle in heightened scrutiny, § 4:20

Relationship to clear and present danger tradition, § 4:22

**CAUSATION PRINCIPLE—Cont'd**

As core principle in heightened scrutiny, § 4:20—Cont'd

Relationship to least restrictive means test, § 4:21

**CBS, INC. v. FCC**

Content regulation of political campaigns and reasonable access, § 26:12

**CEMETERIES**

Limits on picketing and demonstrations, § 5:11.50

**CENSORSHIP**

Content, see entries beginning with terms: **Content**

Prior restraints and current obscenity standards: use of informal pressure to censor adult material, § 14:63

Special power of, of prior restraints, § 15:10

Use of Hicklin test to censor serious literature, § 14:5

**CENTRAL HUDSON TEST**

Evolution of commercial speech doctrine, § 20:5

Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc. decision, § 20:8

Decision, § 20:6

Refinement in Board of Trustees v. Fox, § 20:7

**CHALKING ON PUBLIC PROPERTY**

Symbolic speech, issues posed by “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” demonstrations, § 11:32

**CHAMBERS**

Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: communicating in camera in, § 25:10

**CHAPLINSKY v. NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine in Chaplinsky case: modification of Chaplinsky

## INDEX

### **CHAPLINSKY v. NEW**

#### **HAMPSHIRE—Cont'd**

- fighting words concept, § 10:32
- Court's rejection of categorical jurisprudence of, in *R.A.V.*, § 12:16
- Link between *Roth* and, § 14:8
- Outdated categorical approach of, § 2:70

### **CHARITIES**

- Disclosure, charitable donors, § 4:32

### **CHECKING VALUE AND CONTROL OF POWER ABUSE**

- Free speech contribution to, § 2:31

### **CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION ACT**

- Generally, § 27:22.50

### **CHILD PORNOGRAPHY**

- See **Obscene (and Pornographic) Speech**

### **CHILDREN**

- See **Minors**

### **CINCINNATI v. DISCOVERY NETWORK, INC.**

- Commercial speech in context of regulation for aesthetic or environmental purposes: singling out commercial speech, § 20:41
- Evolution of commercial speech doctrine in, § 20:8

### **CITIZENS UNITED v. FEDERAL ELECTION COM'N**

- Corporate electioneering expenditures, see **Political Financing**

### **CITY HALLS**

- Public forum and non-public forum doctrines, § 8:32

### **CIVIL JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS**

- Press access to, § 25:12

### **CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT**

- Governmental use of racial speech and affirmative action, § 13:18
- Stigmatizing governmental speech, § 13:19

### **CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT —Cont'd**

- Governmental use of racial speech and affirmative action: benign use of racial speech by government, § 13:20
- Adarand Constructors v. Peña*: overruling of *Metro*, § 13:22
- Metro Broadcasting* decision, § 13:21
- Heightened scrutiny forms
- The 303 Creative decision, § 4:26.10
- Hostile environments, see **Employment Discrimination**
- Overview, § 13:1
- "Political Process Doctrine," intersection of equality and free speech, § 13:43
- Prior restraints in civil rights enforcement, § 13:42
- Purposeful discrimination, content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, § 3:6.40
- Specific contexts of commercial speech in equality and, § 20:42
- Violence, intimidation, and vigilante conduct, § 13:23

### **CLAIBORNE HARDWARE DECISION**

- Applying *Brandenburg* intent and Imminence standard and, § 10:28

### **CLASSES OF SPEECH**

- Regulation of classes of speech for reasons relating to proscribability of the class, *R.A.V.* decision and, § 12:18

### **CLASSROOM DISCUSSION**

- Applications of academic freedom principle: control of, § 17:35

### **CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER**

- Applying *Brandenburg* standard, § 10:26
- Applied in *Hess v. Indiana*, § 10:27
- Claiborne Hardware* decision, § 10:28

**CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER**

**—Cont'd**

- Applying Brandenburg standard: aiding and abetting crimes, § 10:35
- Rice v. Paladin Press, case study, § 10:36
- Applying Brandenburg standard: hecklers and hostile audiences, § 10:37
- Competing tensions, § 10:38
- Feiner decision, § 10:41
- Rights of hecklers and hostile audiences, § 10:39
- Terminiello decision, § 10:40
- Applying Brandenburg standard: immediacy and likelihood requirements, § 10:29
- Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine, § 10:31
- Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine in Chaplinsky case, § 10:32
- Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine in Chaplinsky case: modification of Chaplinsky fighting words concept, § 10:33
- Importance of demonstrating imminent harm, § 10:30
- Applying Brandenburg standard: intent requirement, § 10:34
- Applying Brandenburg standard: unlawful assembly, § 10:36.60
- Beginnings of, § 10:1
- Debs case, § 10:6
- Early Holmes opinions: “bad tendency” concept in Schenck decision, § 10:4
- Frohwerk decision, § 10:5
- Historical backdrop, § 10:2
- Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of “bad tendency,” § 10:7
- Brandeis opinion in Whitney, § 10:13
- Holmes dissent in Abrams v. United States, § 10:8
- Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of “bad

**CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER**

**—Cont'd**

- tendency”: Gitlow decision, § 10:9
- Applying First Amendment to the states, § 10:10
- Deferring to legislative determinations that clear and present danger exists, § 10:11
- Holmes and Brandeis dissents, § 10:12
- Border searches, § 10:20.60
- Children, restricting access of children to violent material, § 10:36.50
- Evolution toward rigorous (road to Brandenburg ), § 10:14
- Emergence of meaningful First Amendment protection for vitriolic dissent: De Jonge decision, § 10:15
- Herndon v. Lowry decision, § 10:16
- Evolution toward rigorous: prosecution of communists in the 1950s and, § 10:17
- Communist prosecutions legacy, § 10:20
- Distinguishing between advocacy and action in Yates, Scales, and Noto decisions, § 10:19
- Free speech setback in Dennis decision, § 10:18
- Intent and imminence standard in Brandenburg v. Ohio, § 10:21
- Bond and Watts decisions, § 10:22
- Intent and imminence standard in Brandenburg v. Ohio: the decision, § 10:23
- Brandenburg test a version of clear and present danger test, § 10:25
- Facts and holding, § 10:24
- Protests, liability, organizers and leaders, § 10:44
- Relationship to tradition of, causation principle in heightened scrutiny and, § 4:22
- Terrorism, freedom of association and, § 10:20.50

## INDEX

### **CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER—Cont'd**

- The Counterman decision
  - True threats, Court clarifies, § 10:22.60
  - “True threats,” Court clarifies, § 10:22.70
- True threats
  - Court clarifies, The Counterman decision, § 10:22.60
  - “True threats,” § 10:22.50
  - Court clarifies, The Counterman decision, § 10:22.70
- Violence and online communications, § 10:42
- Violence and on-line communications
  - Protests, liability, organizers and leaders, § 10:44
  - The Portland “Nuremberg Files” litigation, § 10:43

### **CLINICS**

- Abortion, see **Abortion Protest**

### **CLOTHING**

- School regulation of
  - Regulation of clothing and related forms of expression, § 17:17

### **CLUBS**

- Meeting after school: Mergens and Good News Club decision, § 8:22
- Publications and theatrical presentations, § 17:14
- Public forum doctrines, § 8:23
- Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to sexually oriented dance, § 9:21

### **COHEN v. CALIFORNIA**

- Emotion principle in, § 4:11
- Liability for disclosing name of confidential source, § 25:28

### **COLLATERAL BAR RULE**

- Contempt of court and, see **Contempt of Court**

### **COLONIAL EXPERIENCE**

- Free speech, § 1:3
  - Blackstone and the English Common Law, § 1:5

### **COLONIAL EXPERIENCE—Cont'd**

- Free speech, § 1:3—Cont'd
  - Strengths and weaknesses of Blackstone and Zenger principles, § 1:6
  - Zenger’s trial, § 1:4

### **COLORADO II DECISION**

- “Coordinated expenditures” and, § 16:14.10

### **COLORADO REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE DECISION**

- Political process (and First Amendment): “Soft Money,” § 16:14

### **COMMERCIAL INTEREST PROTECTION**

- Prior restraint applied in, § 15:59

### **COMMERCIAL SPEECH**

- Abortion procedures, § 20:32.10
- Advertising of art, underlying art, distinguishing, § 20:41.30
- Aesthetic or environmental purposes, regulation for
  - Generally, § 20:38
- Singling out commercial speech:
  - Metromedia and Discovery Network, § 20:41
- Substantial state interests, § 20:39
- Telemarketing, § 20:40
- Application of doctrines of
  - Generally, § 20:10
  - Burden of proof, § 20:11
- Corporate speech on social and policy issues, § 20:17
- Illegal activities or false and misleading activities, regulation of the speech involving, below
  - Overbreadth exception, § 20:12
  - Truthful advertising of legal activities, § 20:18
- Attorney bar admission regulations, § 20:27.50
- Bankruptcy regulation and debt relief advertising, § 20:31.50
- Central Hudson test, evolution of doctrine
  - Generally, § 20:5

**COMMERCIAL SPEECH—Cont'd**

- Central Hudson test, evolution of doctrine—Cont'd
  - Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc. decision, § 20:8
  - Decision, § 20:6
  - Refinement in Board of Trustees v. Fox, § 20:7
- Commercial trafficking in records obtained from government agencies, § 20:47
- Compelled generic advertising: the Glickman decision, § 20:45
- Compelled speech v. compelled subsidies, the Johanns decision, § 19:25.50
- Databases regulation, § 20:48
- Defense of expanding protection for, § 20:43
- Directories of professionals that sell advertising, § 20:31.40
- Disclaimers, forced informational disclaimers distinguished from forced advocacy, § 20:45.70
- “Do not call” list controversy, § 20:40.50
- Environmental purposes. Aesthetic or environmental purposes, regulation for, above
- Evolution of doctrine of, § 20:1
  - Central Hudson test, above
  - Emergence of protection, § 20:4
  - Ill-considered commercial speech “exception”: Valentine v. Chrestensen, § 20:2
  - Makings of a revolution: 44 Liquormart v. Rhode Island, § 20:9
  - Railway Express Agency v. New York, § 20:3
- Exception of, to vagueness and overbreadth doctrines, § 6:12
- Forced informational disclaimers distinguished from forced advocacy, § 20:45.70
- “Forced speech” in the commercial context, § 20:44
- Illegal activities or false and misleading activities, regulation of the speech involving
  - Generally, § 20:13

**COMMERCIAL SPEECH—Cont'd**

- Illegal activities or false and misleading activities, regulation of the speech involving—Cont'd
  - Distinguishing inherently misleading from potentially misleading advertising, § 20:15
  - Illegal activity, § 20:16
  - Misleading activities, § 20:14
- Informed consent, § 20:32.10
- Johanns decision, § 19:25.50
- Judges, regulation of sitting, § 20:31.45
- Legal professionals; speech concerning the legal system, § 20:37.60
- Political speech intersection with commercial speech, regulation, § 20:31.30
- Prior restraints in commercial speech cases, § 20:46
- Professional directories that sell advertising, § 20:31.40
- Professional services
  - Generally, § 20:27
  - Abortion procedures, § 20:32.10
  - Bankruptcy regulation and debt relief advertising, § 20:31.50
  - Health care activities, § 20:32
  - Ibanez decision, § 20:36
  - Informed consent and abortion procedures, § 20:32.10
  - Lawyer blogs, regulation, § 20:31.30
  - Lower court decisions, § 20:37
  - Off-label drug promotion and marketing, § 20:32.60
  - Ohralik and Primus decisions, § 20:29
- Pharmaceutical advertising:
  - Thompson v. Western States, § 20:32.50
- Professional speech regulation, § 20:37.40
- Securities regulation, § 20:33
- Specialty advertising, § 20:31
- Thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, § 20:30

## INDEX

### COMMERCIAL SPEECH—Cont'd

- Public forum spaces, limitations on commercial vending, § 20:49
- Regulation of intersection of political and commercial speech, § 20:31.30
- Regulations that favor commercial over political and noncommercial speech, § 20:41.50
- R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company decision, § 20:45.70
- Specific contexts of
  - Generally, § 20:26
  - Accountants and other professional services, § 20:34
  - Aesthetic or environmental purposes, regulation for, above
  - Attorney advertising and solicitation, § 20:28
  - Attorney bar admission regulations, § 20:27.50
  - Edenfield v. Fane, § 20:35
  - Equality and civil rights enforcement, § 20:42
  - Professional services, above

### COMMERCIAL VENDING

- Public forum spaces, limitations, § 20:49

### COMMON LAW

- English, see **English Common Law**
- Source of reporter's privilege in, § 25:18

### COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT

- Electronic media: free speech on the internet, § 27:20
- On-line defamation and Section 230 of, § 23:12

### COMMUNISTS

- Evolution toward rigorous clear and present danger test in prosecution of (1950s), § 10:17
- Communist prosecutions legacy, § 10:20
- Distinguishing between advocacy and action in Yates, Scales,

### COMMUNISTS—Cont'd

- Evolution toward rigorous clear and present danger test in prosecution of (1950s), § 10:17
  - Cont'd
  - and Noto decisions, § 10:19
- Free speech setback in Dennis decision, § 10:18

### COMMUNITY STANDARDS

- Ashcroft v. ACLU, community standards and internet, § 14:66
- Patently offensive sexual material defined by, in Miller test, § 14:32
- Prurient interest in Miller test and, § 14:23
- Redeeming value requirement of Miller test not determined by, § 14:35

### COMPELLED SPEECH

- Heightened Scrutiny, 303 Creative decision, § 4:26.10
- Johanns decision, §§ 19:25.50, 20:45.60

### COMPETING TENSIONS

- Applying Brandenburg standard and, § 10:37

### CONDUCT

- See specific matter

### CONFERENCE CENTERS

- Public forum doctrines, § 8:30.50

### CONFIDENCE

- Disciplining government employees for speech activity, when speech is disruptive (applying balancing test), § 18:19

### CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE

- Liability for disclosing name of confidential source: Cohen decision, § 25:28

### CONGESTION

- Permissible time, place, or manner regulations to control traffic flow and, § 8:47

**CONGRESSIONAL  
AUTHORIZATION OF PRIOR  
RESTRAINTS**

Pentagon papers litigation: opinions of Justices White, Stewart, and Marshall on significance of, § 15:19

**CONNICK DECISION**

Disciplining government employees for speech activity: Pickering, Connick, and Waters cases, § 18:6

Evolution of public concern/disruption test: Pickering and Connick, § 18:7

Religious objections to performance of official duties, § 18:20.60

**CONSTITUTIONAL  
FRAMEWORK**

Of broadcast regulation, § 26:1

Constitutional foundations for regulation, § 26:3

Tradition of regulation, § 26:2

**CONSTITUTIONAL POWER**

Understanding the O'Brien test, prong one as, § 9:7

Application to state and local laws, § 9:9

Prong one is superfluous, § 9:8

**CONTEMPT OF COURT**

Against judge, judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:50.50

Procedural issues concerning prior restraints: contempt of court and collateral bar rule, § 15:72

Lessons of Walker and Shuttlesworth decisions, § 15:73

Transparently invalid exception, § 15:74

Transparently invalid exception: Providence Journal decision, § 15:76

Transparently invalid exception: statement in Walker, § 15:75

**CONTENT-BASED REGULATION**

Abortion protest: no protection for use of force, threat of force, physical obstruction, or damage to property: illegal conduct regulation vs. viewpoint or, § 13:35

Circumstances where, received reduced scrutiny, § 2:68

Closure of adult establishments used for solicitation of prostitution or other illegal activity unrelated to content of expression, in applying current obscenity standards against pornography, § 14:55

Content-neutral regulation vs., § 2:66

See also **Content-Neutral Regulation vs. Content-Based Regulation**

Of broadcast, see **Broadcast Regulation**

Of cable television, § 27:13

Attempts to regulate indecency, § 27:14

Cable operators' self-imposed prohibitions on indecency, § 27:15

Indecency scrambling and blocking, § 27:14

Strict scrutiny as default standard for, § 4:1

Strict scrutiny as default mode, § 4:2

Strict scrutiny displaced by other forms of heightened scrutiny, § 4:3

Strict scrutiny displaced by reduced scrutiny, § 4:4

Symbolic speech and, see **Symbolic Speech**

Traditional public forum, § 8:5

Triggering heightened scrutiny, § 2:67

**CONTENT-DISCRIMINATION  
RATIONALE**

Court's, in R.A.V. decision, § 12:17

**CONTENT NEUTRALITY**

Content-based regulation vs., see **Content-Neutral Regulation**

## INDEX

### **CONTENT NEUTRALITY—Cont'd vs. Content-Based Regulation**

Hate speech on campus and, § 17:28  
Permit rules, *Thomas v. Chicago Park District*, prior restraint doctrine, § 15:71.50

Public forums, see **Public Forum Doctrines**

Regulation

Incidental, see *United States v. O'Brien* standard

Of speech permitted under *O'Brien* test, see *United States v. O'Brien* standard

Public forum and, §§ 8:35 to 8:50, 8:48.20

See also **Public forum doctrines**

Small gatherings, § 8:48.20

Summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to hate speech and protection, of persons or property, § 12:24

Symbolic speech and, see **Symbolic speech**

Traditional public forum, § 8:6

Time, place, or manner, see **Time, Place, or Manner Regulations**

University of Wisconsin hate speech regulation, content neutrality analysis by court, § 17:23

### **CONTENT-NEUTRAL REGULATION vs. CONTENT-BASED REGULATION**

Bivens, purposeful discrimination requirements, § 3:6.40

Civil rights laws, purposeful discrimination requirements, § 3:6.40

Content-based regulation vs., § 2:66

Criminalizing mere “lies,” *Stolen Valor Act* example, § 3:7.50

Event-based discrimination, § 3:4.75

Governmental entities themselves possess no free speech rights, § 3:13

Harm of content-neutral vs. content-based laws, § 3:2

### **CONTENT-NEUTRAL REGULATION vs. CONTENT-BASED REGULATION—Cont'd**

Impersonation of police and other government officials, § 3:7.60

Inquiry into justifying regulation without reference to message content, § 3:3

Distinguishing content from mode of expression, § 3:4.50

Examining justification for the regulation, § 3:4

Mixed motive cases, § 3:4.30

Inquiry into justifying regulation without reference to message content: law may be content-based even in absence of “invidious intent to discriminate or censor,” § 3:5

Distinguishing “justifications based upon content” from “intent to censor,” § 3:6

Finding content discrimination in absence of intent to censor: *Simon & Schuster* decision, § 3:7

Law enforcement and other government officials, impersonation, § 3:7.60

Purposeful discrimination requirements of § 1983, Bivens, and other civil rights laws, § 3:6.40

Relaxing prohibition on viewpoint discrimination when government is speaker, § 3:12

Retaliation claims, § 3:14

§ 1983 and other civil rights laws, purposeful discrimination requirements, § 3:6.40

*Stolen Valor Act*, criminalizing mere “lies,” § 3:7.50

Two tracks of judicial review in distinguishing, § 3:1

*United States v. Alvarez*, criminalizing mere “lies,” § 3:7.50

Viewpoint discrimination

Generally, § 3:8

Distinguishing content discrimination from viewpoint

**CONTENT-NEUTRAL**

**REGULATION vs.**

**CONTENT-BASED**

**REGULATION—Cont’d**

Viewpoint discrimination—Cont’d  
discrimination: court’s  
pronouncements in *R.A.V. v.*  
*City of St. Paul*, § 3:10

Heavy presumption against  
viewpoint discrimination,  
§ 3:11

Viewpoint discrimination is subset  
of content discrimination,  
§ 3:9

*Virginia v. Black*, cross-burning  
reprised, § 3:10.50

**CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS**

Expression, enforcing contracts  
restricting, prior restraint,  
§ 15:59.50

**CONTROVERSIAL POSITIONS**

Academic freedom and taking, see  
**Education**

**CONVENTION CENTERS**

Public forum doctrines, § 8:30.50

**CONVENTIONS**

Regulation of political processes and:  
campaigns, primaries, elections,  
and parties, nominating conven-  
tions, § 16:30.50

**COPYRIGHT**

*Eldred v. Ashcroft* sustains copyright  
extension, § 21:7.50

Government as speaker: philosophi-  
cal issues posed, § 19:2.60

Infringement, Internet, § 21:14

Preemption of copyright, “breaking  
news,” § 21:15

Prior restraint applied in cases of,  
§ 15:60

Tensions between intellectual prop-  
erty and First Amendment and  
duration of, § 21:7

**CORE PRINCIPLES**

Heightened scrutiny, see **Heightened  
Scrutiny**

**CORONAVIRUS**

Pandemic restrictions, § 16:43

**CORPORATE SPEECH**

See also **Commercial Speech**

Application of commercial speech  
doctrines and, on social and  
policy issues, §§ 20:16, 20:17

Political, see **Political Financing**

**COUNTERMAN DECISION**

Clear and present danger

True threats, Court clarifies,  
§ 10:22.60

“True threats,” Court clarifies,  
§ 10:22.70

Intent and imminence standard

True threats, § 10:22.60

“True threats,” § 10:22.70

**COURSE CONTENT**

Applications of academic freedom  
principle, § 17:34

**COURTHOUSES AND JAILS**

As forums, § 8:32

**COURTROOMS**

Public forum doctrines, § 8:32.50

**COVID-19**

Pandemic restrictions, § 16:43

**COWGILL DECISION**

As case study on notion of “intent to  
communicate,” § 11:6

**CRAWFORD DECISION**

Political process, challenges to  
“Voter ID” laws, § 16:40

**CRIMINAL JUDICIAL  
PROCEEDINGS**

Content-neutral regulation vs.  
content-based regulation,  
criminalizing mere “lies,”  
§ 3:7.50

Press access to, see **Newsgathering**

**CRIMINAL PROSECUTION**

National security, publishing leaked  
classified national security infor-  
mation, § 25:45.70

## INDEX

### CRITICAL CONTENT THEORY

- In two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles, § 11:22
- Case study in determining content-neutrality in context of symbolic speech: antimask legislation, § 11:25
- Hate speech example, § 11:24
- Nude dancing example, § 11:23
- Recreational dancing, § 11:23.50
- Smoking bans and First Amendment, § 11:23.60

### CRITICAL MASS THEORY

- In determining whether facility is nonforum: requirement of intent to create designated public forum, § 8:15

### CRITICAL RACE THEORY

- Education, § 17:34.30

### CROSS-BURNING

- Virginia v. Black , viewpoint discrimination
- Content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, § 3:10.50
- Reinterpretation of R.A.V. case, § 12:21.50

### CURATOR

- Government as, see **Government**

### CURRENT OBSCENITY STANDARDS

- Application of, see **Obscene Speech**

### DAMAGE TO PROPERTY

- In abortion protest, see **Abortion Protest**

### DANCE CLUBS

- Application of current obscenity standards to, § 14:37
- Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to sexually oriented, § 9:21

### DANCING

- See also **Nude Dancing**

### DANCING—Cont'd

- Recreational dancing, two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles, critical content theory, § 11:23.50
- Understanding the O'Brien test: case study in application of suppression of free expression in problem of nude, § 9:14

### DATABASES

- Commercial speech, § 20:48

### DAVIS v. FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

- Political processes and elections, "Millionaires Amendment," § 16:21

### DEBS DECISION

- Beginnings of clear and present danger test and, § 10:6

### DEBT RELIEF SERVICES

- Commercial speech in context of professional services, § 20:31.50

### DEFAMATION

- Creation of First Amendment standards for libel, § 23:1
- Actual malice standard, § 23:3
- Facts and holding of New York Times case, § 23:2
- Government, no libel against, § 23:3.50
- Definition of public official, § 23:3.75
- Equal opportunities for access in broadcast: absolute protection against defamation liability, § 26:14
- Food disparagement laws, proliferation of, § 23:13
- Foreign libel judgments, enforcement, § 23:14
- Matters of public concern standard, § 23:5
- On-line defamation and Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, § 23:12
- Prior restraint applied in, § 15:57

**DEFAMATION—Cont'd**

- Protection of opinion (or “non-fact”), § 23:9
- Supreme Court’s holding in *Milkovich v. Lorain Journal*, § 23:11
- Traditional fact/opinion distinction, § 23:10
- Public figures/private figures, § 23:4
- Public official defined, § 23:3.75
- Requirement of false statement of fact, § 23:6
- Clear and convincing evidence standard, § 23:7.50
- Falsity: *Hepps* decision, § 23:7
- Notion of “substantial truth,” § 23:8
- Special First Amendment press protection, § 22:12
- Tory v. Cochran* Supreme Court decision, § 15:57.50

**DEFAULT STANDARD**

- Strict scrutiny as, for content-based regulation, § 4:1
- Strict scrutiny as default mode, § 4:2
- Strict scrutiny displaced by other forms of heightened scrutiny, § 4:3
- Strict scrutiny displaced by reduced scrutiny, § 4:4

**DE JONGE DECISION**

- Emergence of meaningful First Amendment protection for vitriolic dissent in, § 10:15

**DEMOCRACY**

- Free speech contributions to, § 2:30
- Checking value and control of power abuse, § 2:31
- Facilitating majority rule, § 2:32
- Free speech as safety valve for stability, § 2:35
- Participation function, § 2:33
- Pursuit of enlightened public policy, § 2:34

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE DECISION**

- Content regulation of broadcasts since *Red Lion* in, § 26:7
- No general right of access to broadcasters, § 26:9
- State action question, § 26:8

**DEMOCRATIC SELF-GOVERNANCE**

- Generally, § 2:26
- Alexander Meiklejohn’s influence, § 2:28
- And theory of free speech, generally, § 2:6
- Free speech and democratic process, § 2:27

**DEMONSTRATIONS**

- Limits on demonstrations at cemeteries and funerals, § 5:11.50
- Restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:54

**DENNIS DECISION**

- Evolution toward rigorous clear and present danger test in prosecution of communists: free speech setback in, § 10:18

**DEPICTION**

- Obscene, see **Obscene Speech**

**DESIGNATED PUBLIC FORUMS**

- See also **Public Forum Doctrines**
- Defined, § 8:7
- Significance of distinction between traditional and, § 8:9

**DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY**

- Abortion protest and prohibited, § 13:28

**DIAL-A-PORN**

- Application of current obscenity standards to, § 14:41

**DIRECT BROADCAST SATELLITE (DBS)**

- Cable television, § 27:16

## INDEX

### DIRECT-MAIL SOLICITATIONS

Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by attorneys: thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, § 20:30

### DIRECTORIES

Professional directories that sell advertising, § 20:31.40

### DISCIPLINING

Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press, attorney disciplinary proceedings, § 25:43.50

Of government employees, see **Government Employees**

Of student for school-related off-campus Internet posting, § 17:4.70

### DISCLAIMER

Commercial speech, distinguishing forced informational disclaimers from forced advocacy, § 20:45.70

Corporate political expenditures: Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n decision, § 16:19

### DISCLOSURE

Ballots, § 16:31.50

Charitable donors, § 4:32

Corporate political expenditures: Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n decision, § 16:19

Liability for disclosing name of confidential source: Cohen decision, § 25:28

Marked ballots, § 16:31.50

"National security letters," non-disclosure requirements, prior restraint, § 15:22.50

Political process, petition signatures, § 16:38.50

### DISCOVERY NETWORK

#### DECISION

See Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc.

### DISCRIMINATION

Conduct, summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to hate speech and, § 12:25

Content, see entries beginning with terms: **Content**

Purposeful discrimination requirements, civil rights laws, § 3:6.40

### DISFAVORABLE TREATMENT

Special First Amendment press protection and prohibition against singling out press for specially, § 22:14

### DISRUPTIVE SPEECH

By government employees, see **Government Employees**

Student, Bethel School District v. Fraser, § 17:4

### DISTRIBUTION

Prior restraint in national security cases: restrictions on distribution of material on military bases, § 15:23

### DOCTRINE

See also specific doctrines

Of free speech, generally, § 2:13

See also **Free Speech**

### DOCUMENTS

Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: access to court, documents and exhibits, § 25:7

### DOLAN v. CITY OF TIGARD

Rough proportionality standard of, § 7:14

### DOMESTIC RELATIONS

Prior restraint doctrine, § 15:58.70

### DONORS

Forced disclosure, heightened scrutiny, § 4:32

### "DO NOT CALL" LIST

#### CONTROVERSY

Commercial speech, § 20:40.50

**DOOR-TO-DOOR CANVASSING**

Prior restraint doctrine, restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:54.50

**DRAG PERFORMANCES**

Application of current obscenity standards, Restrictions, § 14:40.50

**DRESS**

School regulation of, see **Education**

**DRINKING**

Government regulation of, see **Vices**

**DRIVER'S PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT**

Generally, § 24:20

**ECONOMIC INTEREST PROTECTION**

Prior restraint applied in, § 15:59

**EDENFIELD v. FANE**

Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by accountants and other professional services, § 20:35

**EDITOR**

Government as, see **Government**

**EDUCATION**

Academic freedom and  
     Claims of academic researcher's privilege, § 17:38.60  
     Faculty members' speech, below  
     Admissions interviews, First Amendment claims arising from, § 17:43  
     Advance notice requirements prior to engaging in expressive activity, § 17:45  
     Applications of academic principle  
         Generally, § 17:33  
         Control over classroom discussion, § 17:35  
         Controversial or politically incorrect positions. Politically incorrect positions, below

**EDUCATION—Cont'd**

Applications of academic principle  
     —Cont'd  
         Course content and grading policy, § 17:34  
         critical race theory, § 17:34.30  
         Critical race theory, § 17:34.30  
         Government employees, job duty test, § 18:8.70  
         Grading policy and standards, § 17:34.50  
     Association and disassociation  
         freedom and forcing inclusion, § 17:41  
         Membership eligibility discrimination by student groups, § 17:42  
     Bullying, schools, § 17:17.50  
     Clothing, school regulation of  
         Regulation of clothing and related forms of expression, § 17:17  
     Controversial or politically incorrect positions. Politically incorrect positions, below  
     Cross-reference to public forum law  
         Generally, § 17:26  
         Nature of the university, § 17:27  
         Overriding requirement of content neutrality, § 17:28  
     Faculty members' speech and academic freedom  
         Generally, § 17:30  
         Academic freedom, the First Amendment, and the Supreme Court, § 17:32  
         Applications of academic principle, above  
         First Amendment right to academic freedom as right separate and apart from recognized rights, § 17:31.50  
         Legal sources of academic freedom, § 17:31  
     First Amendment  
         Admissions interviews, § 17:43  
         Educational missions, § 17:1  
         License and accreditation requirement challenges, § 17:44  
         “Forced speech” doctrine, § 17:1.50

## INDEX

### EDUCATION—Cont'd

- Free speech rights of parents to criticize school officials, § 17:46
- Hate speech regulation on campuses
  - Generally, § 17:18
  - Conclusion: hate speech and coercion vs. persuasive leadership on campuses, § 17:29
  - Cross-reference to public forum law, above
  - Relevance of R.A.V., § 17:25
  - Special problems of regulating, § 17:19
- University of Wisconsin litigation, below
- Hostile environment, schools, § 17:17.50
- Internet, restricting research on, § 17:39
- License and accreditation requirement challenges, § 17:44
- Military recruitment in schools, § 17:1.60
- Politically incorrect positions
  - Generally, § 17:36
  - Levin litigation, § 17:38
  - Political correctness debate, § 17:37
- Publications and theatrical presentations, § 17:8
  - Activities at high schools and elementary schools:
    - Hazlewood v. Kuhlmeier, § 17:10
  - Activities at universities, § 17:9
  - Nonschool-sponsored activities, § 17:13
  - Private clubs, § 17:14
  - Refusals to accept advertising, § 17:12
  - Theatrical presentations, § 17:11
- Regulation of clothing, appearance, and other expressive activity, § 17:15
  - Hair regulation, § 17:16
  - Regulation of clothing and related forms of expression, § 17:17
- Regulation schoolbook publishers, § 17:34.40

### EDUCATION—Cont'd

- Religious speech, § 17:40
- Rumsfeld v. FAIR, § 17:1.60
- School libraries
  - Generally, § 17:5
  - Lower court decisions, § 17:7
  - Pico decision, § 17:6
- School newspapers, censorship, § 17:10.50
- School-related off-campus Internet posting, disciplining student, § 17:4.70
- School-sanctioned events: Morse v. Frederick the “Bong Hits 4 Jesus” case, § 17:4.50
- Solomon Amendment, § 17:1.60
- Student speech, § 17:2
  - Disruptive speech: Bethel School District v. Fraser, § 17:4
  - Nondisruptive symbolic speech: Tinker v. Des Moines, § 17:3
- University distinguished from secondary and pre-secondary students, § 17:2.50
- University distinguished from secondary and pre-secondary students, § 17:2.50
- University of Wisconsin litigation
  - Generally, § 17:20
  - Asserted parallel to Title VII law, § 17:24
  - Content-neutrality analysis by court, § 17:23
  - Fighting words analysis by court, § 17:22
  - Rules of the university, § 17:21
- Viewpoint discrimination, § 17:15

### EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

- See also **Public Schools**
- Nature of, and public forum, § 8:20

### EICHMAN DECISION

- Flag desecration and, see **Flag Desecration Cases**

### ELDRED V. ASHCROFT

- Copyright extension, sustaining, § 21:7.50

## ELECTIONEERING SPEECH

Corporate electioneering  
expenditures in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n* decision, § **16:17**

## ELECTIONS

Ballot disclosure, § **16:31.50**  
Candidate's right to spend own money, § **16:21**  
*Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n* decision, corporate electioneering expenditures  
Disclaimers and disclosures, § **16:19**  
Electioneering speech, § **16:17**  
Press Clause, § **22:15**  
Right to engage in political expenditures, § **16:18**  
Crawford decision, challenges to "Voter ID" laws, § **16:40**  
Disclosure of marked voter ballots, § **16:31.50**  
Federal Election Commission v. *Beaumont*, nonprofit advocacy groups, § **16:20**  
Financing, see **Political Financing**  
Leveling the financing playing field: *Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club Pac v. Bennett* decision, § **16:21.50**  
Limiting foreign influences on elections, § **16:44**  
Loans from candidates to campaigns, § **16:21.30**  
"Millionaires Amendment" decision in *Davis v. Federal Elections Commission*, § **16:21**  
Political calls, telemarketing restrictions, § **16:41**  
Public forum doctrines. polling places, § **8:33.30**  
Regulation of political processes  
Generally, §§ **16:23 to 16:31**  
Campaigns, primaries, elections, and parties  
see also **Political Process**  
generally, § **16:25**  
access to ballots and elections: racial exclusions, § **16:26**

## ELECTIONS—Cont'd

Regulation of political processes  
—Cont'd  
Campaigns, primaries, elections, and parties—Cont'd  
ballot access restrictions, § **16:27**  
ballot initiatives, § **16:27.50**  
blanket primaries, § **16:25.50**  
false political advertising, § **16:32.30**  
incumbent protection laws, § **16:35.10**  
loyalty oaths, § **16:29**  
nominating conventions, § **16:30.50**  
political parties, § **16:30**  
restrictions on activity near polling places: *Burson v. Freeman* decision, § **16:31**  
*Mills v. Alabama*, § **16:24**  
Restricting contributions, candidates who accept public funds, § **16:21.60**  
Restrictions on automated political calls and recorded messages, § **16:41**  
Restrictions on voluntary political contributions of government employees, § **16:22**  
Telemarketing restrictions, political calls, § **16:41**

## ELECTRONIC DATABASES

Commercial speech, regulation of databases, § **20:48**

## ELECTRONIC MEDIA

*Barnticki v. Vopper*, illegal interception, § **25:45.50**  
Privacy in the home and: blocking broadcasting and other electronic media entering the home, § **5:8**  
Other electronic media: implications of *Sable* decision, § **5:10**  
*Pacifica* ruling and related issue of sheltering children from offensive speech, § **5:9**

## INDEX

### ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Activities at, Hazlewood v. Kihlmeier, § 17:10

### ELROD v. BURNS

Political speech and government employees: patronage cases, § 16:5

### EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

Group libel, individual libel and infliction of, compared, § 12:8

Privacy and infliction of, § 24:7

Hustler background, § 24:10

Hustler opinion, § 24:11

Hustler v. Falwell litigation, § 24:9

Overview of the tort, § 24:8

### EMOTION PRINCIPLE

As core principle in heightened scrutiny, § 4:9

Cohen v. California decision, § 4:11

Hustler Magazine v. Falwell decision, § 4:12

Inroads on emotion principle, § 4:13

Protecting emotional as well as intellectual components of speech, § 4:10

Relationship of, to court's discussion of viewpoint discrimination in R.A.V. decision, § 12:20

### EMPLOYEES

Government, see **Government Employees**

### EMPLOYMENT

#### DISCRIMINATION

Hostile environment cases in

Generally, §§ 13:2 to 13:17

Hostile environment cases under Title VII, §§ 13:3 to 13:17

Title VII and First Amendment reconciliation, below

Insult and innuendo distinction from protected speech

Generally, § 13:8

Speech causing dysfunction in workplace and merely offensive speech, § 13:9

### EMPLOYMENT

#### DISCRIMINATION—Cont'd

Insult and innuendo distinction from protected speech—Cont'd

Whether offensive speech principles applicable in marketplace apply to speech in the workplace. Workplace vs. marketplace, below

Title VII and First Amendment reconciliation, § 13:4

Insult and innuendo distinction from protected speech, above

Quid pro quo harassment, § 13:7

Speech as evidence of illegal motive or bias, § 13:6

Types of speech giving rise to Title VII liability, § 13:5

Workplace vs. marketplace

Generally, § 13:10

Captive audience concerns, § 13:16

Free association cases, § 13:14

Lessons of public employment cases, § 13:13

Offensive speech standards, § 13:11

Safety valve: protecting speech on matters of public concern, § 13:17

Speech in hostile environment cases inflict more than distress, § 13:15

Whether workplace slurs qualify as speech on matters of public concern, § 13:12

#### EMPLOYMENT DIVISION v. SMITH

Unconstitutional conditions doctrine: special note on unemployment compensation cases, § 7:13

### ENFORCEMENT

Civil rights, see **Civil rights Enforcement**

Defamation (and First Amendment), foreign libel judgments, § 23:14

Expression, contracts restricting, prior restraint, § 15:59.50

**ENGLISH (LANGUAGE)**

Disciplining government employees for speech activity, when speech is disruptive (applying balancing test): restriction on non-English language use in the workplace, § 18:21

**ENGLISH COMMON LAW**

And Blackstone, free speech and, § 1:5  
Strengths and weaknesses of Blackstone principle, § 1:6  
And history of prior restraint, § 15:2

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS**

See **Time, Place, or Manner Regulations**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PURPOSES**

See **Commercial Speech**

**EQUALITY**

Specific contexts of commercial speech in, and civil rights enforcement, § 20:42

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES**

Content regulation of political campaigns and, see **Broadcast Regulation**

**ESPRIT DE CORPS DECISION**

Fostering, and disciplining government employees for speech activity, when speech is disruptive (applying balancing test), § 18:20

**ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE**

Government  
Funding of speech and, § 19:26  
Speech, § 19:1.50

**ETHICAL CONDUCT**

Recusal restrictions: Nevada Commission on Ethics v. Carrigan, § 16:36.50

**EVENTS**

Content regulation, event-based discrimination, § 3:4.75  
Press access to, see **Newsgathering**

**EXCRETORY FUNCTIONS**

Patently offensive depictions or descriptions, Miller test, § 14:31

**EXHIBITION OF GENITALS**

Patently offensive depictions or descriptions, Miller test, § 14:31

**EXHIBITS**

Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: access to court documents and, § 25:8

**EXPEDITIOUS JUDICIAL REVIEW**

Procedural issues concerning prior restraints: Freedman requirements, § 15:65

**EXPERT WITNESSES**

Bans on state employees serving as, § 18:23

**EXPRESSIVE CONDUCT**

Symbolic speech and, see **Symbolic Speech**

**EYES**

Averting, see **Captive Audience**

**FACILITY**

Determining whether facility is nonforum, § 8:10  
Extent of use, § 8:12  
Purpose of forum, § 8:11  
Determining whether facility is nonforum: requirement of intent to create designated public forum, § 8:13  
Alternative emphasis: critical mass theory, § 8:15  
Private entities, attempts to limit forums through commercial arrangements with, § 8:15.50  
Supreme Court emphasis on intent, § 8:14

**FACULTY MEMBERS**

Speech by, see **Education**

**FAIRGROUNDS**

Pedestrian malls, § 8:18.30  
Public forum doctrines, § 8:18.30

## INDEX

### **FAIRGROUNDS—Cont'd**

Urban plazas, § 8:18.30

### **FAIRNESS DOCTRINE**

And administrative and political roller coaster after Red Lion, § 26:10

Content regulation of broadcast, and related issues: Red Lion decision, § 26:5

### **FAIR TRIALS**

Judicial proceedings, prior restraints and, and free press, § 15:28

### **FAIR USE**

Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment: free speech safety valve in, § 21:10

Fair use and parody, § 21:12

Harper & Row decision, § 21:11

### **FAIR WARNING REQUIREMENT**

Narrowing construction saving overboard laws and, § 6:10

### **FALSE LIGHT INVASION OF PRIVACY**

First Amendment and, § 24:3

### **FALSE STATEMENT OF FACT**

Requirement of, for defamation, § 23:6

Clear and convincing evidence standard, § 23:7.50

Falsity: Hepps decision, § 23:7

Notion of “substantial truth,” § 23:8

Stolen Valor Act, criminalizing mere “lies,” § 3:7.50

### **FCC (FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION)**

Broadcast regulation, challenges to FCC’s regulation of “fleeting expletives” as indecency, § 26:28

Government as speech financier: policy and doctrinal tensions, proportionality principle, § 19:13

### **FCC (FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION)—Cont'd**

Regulation of cable television by, see **Cable Television**

### **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION v. BEAUMONT**

Political processes and elections, nonprofit advocacy groups, § 16:20

### **FEINER DECISION**

Applying Brandenburg standard, § 10:41

### **FIGHTING WORDS DOCTRINE**

Brandenburg modification of, § 10:31

Of Chaplinsky case, § 10:32

Of Chaplinsky fighting words concept, § 10:33

Summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to hate speech and, § 12:23

University of Wisconsin hate speech regulation, § 17:22

### **FINANCIER**

Government as speech, § 19:8

Government as speech: policy and doctrinal tensions, § 19:9

Neutrality principle, § 19:10

Proportionality principle, § 19:11

Proportionality principle: FCC v. League of Women Voters decision, § 19:13

Proportionality principle: Regan v. Taxation with Representation decision, § 19:12

Proportionality principle: Rust v. Sullivan decision, § 19:14

### **FINANCING**

Political, see **Political Financing**

### **FINLEY v. NEA**

Government funding the arts and, § 19:20

### **FIRST AMENDMENT**

See **Transgender**

Absolute principles embraced by, § 2:54

**FIRST AMENDMENT—Cont'd**

Academic freedom, § 17:31  
 Right separate and apart from recognized rights, § 17:31.50  
 Supreme Court and, § 17:32  
 Activities at high schools and elementary schools: *Hazlewood v. Kuhlmeier*, censorship of school newspaper in violation of First Amendment, § 17:10.50  
 Admissions interviews, claims arising from, § 17:43  
 And educational missions, § 17:1  
 See also **Education**  
 And history of prior restraint, § 15:2  
 Applying, to the states, *Gitlow* and, § 10:9  
 Cable television: *Turner Broadcasting* decision, § 27:10  
 Cross-reference to general principles of, governing restrictions on dissemination of truthful information, and judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:43  
 Defamation and, see **Defamation**  
 Emergence of meaningful protection for vitriolic dissent under, *De Jonge* decision, § 10:15  
 Gender transition procedures, § 13:44  
 Hate speech governed by regulation principles of, see **Hate Speech**  
 History of, see **First Amendment Background**  
 8220Informal8221 government pressure, litigation, § 6:18  
 Intellectual property and, see **Intellectual Property**  
 Judicial opinions, protection of statements in, § 16:32.60  
 Justiciability doctrines, § 6:17  
 Newsgathering protected by, see **Newsgathering**  
 No immunity in all use of language, § 2:51  
 Not limited to protection of political speech, § 2:40  
 Supreme Court rejection notion of the amendment limited to political speech, § 2:46

**FIRST AMENDMENT—Cont'd**

Not limited to protection of political speech: fallacy of limiting the amendment to political issues, § 2:41  
 Importance does not equate exclusivity, § 2:42  
 Limiting freedom of speech to politics as form of statism, § 2:45  
 Political and nonpolitical inseparable, § 2:44  
 Speech making life worth living, § 2:43  
 Obscenity not protected by, § 14:7  
 Overview of doctrine, § 2:65  
 Political process and, see **Political Process**  
 Press clause and, see **Press Clause**  
 Privacy and, § 24:1  
 Appropriation (the right of publicity), § 24:4  
 False light invasion of privacy, § 24:3  
 Introduction, § 24:2  
 Intrusion, § 24:6  
 Publication of private facts, § 24:5  
 Reconciling Title VII with, see **Employment Discrimination**  
 Rights of transgender persons  
 Protection, § 13:44  
 Statements in judicial opinions, protection, § 16:32.60  
 Symbolic speech, “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” demonstration issues, § 11:30  
 Transition procedure, gender, § 13:44  
 Two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles, critical content theory, § 11:23.60

**FIRST AMENDMENT  
 BACKGROUND**

Adoption of Bill of Rights, § 1:7  
 Relevance of federalism, § 1:9  
 Restatement or rebellion, § 1:8  
 Colonial experience, § 1:3  
 Blackstone and the English Common Law, § 1:5

## INDEX

### FIRST AMENDMENT

#### BACKGROUND—Cont'd

Colonial experience, § 1:3—Cont'd

Strengths and weaknesses of  
Blackstone and Zenger  
principles, § 1:6

Zenger's trial, § 1:4

Modern views of historical debate,  
§ 1:10

Judicial rejection of view that the  
amendment concerns only  
prior restraint, § 1:12

Ongoing scholarly debate, § 1:11

Original intent, § 1:2

Original meaning of the amendment,  
§ 1:1

### FLAG DESECRATION CASES

Generally, § 11:9

In Johnson and Eichman cases,  
§ 11:15

Lessons distilled from the two  
cases, § 11:18

Texas v. Johnson, § 11:16

United States v. Eichman, § 11:17

Prior to Johnson and Eichman,  
§ 11:10

Halter v. Nebraska, § 11:11

Smith v. Goguen, § 11:13

Spence v. Washington, § 11:14

Street v. New York, § 11:12

### “FLEETING EXPLICITIVES”

Broadcast regulation, challenges to  
FCC's regulation of “fleeting  
explicitives” as indecency,  
§ 26:28

### FOOD DISPARAGEMENT LAWS

Defamation and, § 23:13

### FORCE

In abortion protest, see **Abortion  
Protest**

### FORCED SPEECH DOCTRINE

Commercial speech, § 20:44

Education, § 17:1.50

Public sector union dues, § 4:29

Public sector unions, § 4:26.50

State bar associations, § 4:26.20

### FOREIGN JUDGMENTS

Defamation (and First Amendment),  
enforcement, § 23:14

### FOREIGN SPEAKERS

Outside United States, heightened  
scrutiny forms, § 4:30

### 44 LIQUORMART v. RHODE ISLAND

Application of commercial speech  
doctrines, § 20:25

Evolution of commercial speech doc-  
trine in, § 20:9

### FOX ( BOARD OF TRUSTEES v. FOX)

Evolution of commercial speech doc-  
trine: refinement in, § 20:7

### FRAZEE v. ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Unconstitutional conditions doctrine:  
special note on unemployment  
compensation cases, § 7:12

### FREE ASSOCIATION CASES

Whether offensive speech principles  
applicable in marketplace apply  
to speech in the workplace and  
concerns relating to, § 13:14

### FREEDMAN v. MARYLAND

Generally, § 15:65

Adversary hearing, necessity of

Generally, §§ 15:68, 15:69

Ex parte orders, § 15:70

Burden of licensing authority,  
§ 15:67

Content-neutral permit rules, Thomas  
v. Chicago Park District,  
§ 15:71.50

Expeditious judicial review, § 15:71

Freedman decision, § 15:66

Prior restraints in obscenity cases:  
application of current obscenity  
standards, § 14:58

Procedural issues concerning prior  
restraints: requirements of,  
§ 15:65

Adversary hearing, necessity of,  
above

**FREEDMAN v. MARYLAND**

—**Cont'd**

- Procedural issues concerning prior restraints: requirements of, § 15:65—**Cont'd**
- Burden of licensing authority, § 15:67
- Expeditious judicial review, § 15:71
- In the case, § 15:66

**FREEDOM OF ACCESS TO CLINIC ENTRANCES ACT OF 1994**

- Abortion protest and, see **Abortion Protest**

**FREE PRESS**

- Judicial proceedings, prior restraints and, and fair trails, § 15:28

**FROHWERK DECISION**

- Beginnings of clear and present danger test and, § 10:5

**FUNDING THE ARTS**

- Government, § 19:17
- Background, § 19:18
- Finley v. NEA decision, § 19:20
- Politics of the NEA, § 19:19
- Uncertain future of arts funding, § 19:21

**FUNERALS**

- Limits on picketing and demonstrations, § 5:11.50

**GAMBLING**

- Government regulation of, see **Vices**

**GARCETTI v. CEBALLOS DECISION**

- Government employees, speech pursuant to official duties, § 18:8.50

**GENITALS**

- Exhibition of, as patent offensive, Miller test, § 14:31

**GENTILE STANDARD DECISION**

- Judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:46

**GERRYMANDERING**

- Partisan, political process, § 16:42

**GIFTS**

- Lobbyists, § 16:20.20

**GINZBURG DECISION**

- Pandering concept, obscene speech and, § 14:17

**GITLOW DECISION**

- Bad tendency, see **Bad Tendency Concept**

**GLICKMAN DECISION**

- Commercial speech, compelled generic advertising, § 20:45

**GLOBE NEWSPAPER CO. v. SUPERIOR COURT**

- Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: developments after Richmond Newspapers, § 25:5

**GOOD NEWS DECISION**

- Clubs and organizations meeting after school, § 8:22

**GOVERNMENT**

- Absence of free speech rights of governmental entities, § 3:13
- Ad hoc balancing unfairly weighted in favor of legislative judgments, § 2:60
- As educator, see **Education**
- As financier of speech, § 19:8
- As financier of speech: policy and doctrinal tensions, § 19:9
- Neutrality principle, § 19:10
- Proportionality principle, § 19:11
- Proportionality principle: FCC v. League of Women Voters decision, § 19:13
- Proportionality principle: Regan v. Taxation with Representation decision, § 19:12
- Proportionality principle: Rust v. Sullivan decision, § 19:14
- As librarian, curator, and arts impresario, § 19:15
- Decision to move or remove works of art, § 19:15.60

## INDEX

### GOVERNMENT—Cont'd

- As librarian, curator, and arts impresario, § 19:15—Cont'd
  - Monuments in public parks as government speech, § 19:16.50
  - Overview: professionalism concept, § 19:16
- As librarian, curator, and arts impresario: funding the arts, § 19:17
- Background, § 19:18
- Finley v. NEA decision, § 19:20
- Library funding, § 19:23
- Politics of the NEA, § 19:19
- As publisher and editor, § 19:24
- As publisher and editor: using speech regulation to discourage drinking, smoking, gambling, and other vices, § 20:19
- Casino gambling: Posadas de Puerto Rico decision, § 20:20
- Interstate advertising of lotteries, § 20:21
- Tobacco and liquor, § 20:23
- As speaker, § 19:1
- As speaker: philosophical issues posed
  - Generally, §§ 19:2 to 19:7
  - Can speech be simultaneously “government” and “private?,” § 19:2.75
- Copyright, § 19:2.60
- Intellectual property registration, § 19:2.60
- Political establishment clause, § 19:3
- Simultaneously “government” and “private” speech, possibility of, § 19:2.75
- Sons of Confederate Veterans license plate case, defining government speech: case study, § 19:2.50
- Supreme Court rejection of notion of political establishment clause, § 19:4
- Trademark, § 19:2.60
- As speaker: philosophical issues posed in Meese v. Keene and

### GOVERNMENT—Cont'd

- government as propagandist, § 19:5
- Critical view of the case, § 19:7
- Holding in the case, § 19:6
- Computers, restricting access to sexually explicit material vis, § 27:23
- Deferring to legislative determinations that clear and present danger exists, Gitlow and, § 10:11
- Establishment Clause
  - Funding of speech and, § 19:26
  - Speech and, § 19:1.50
- Heightened scrutiny forms, government speech, Johans decision, § 4:27.60
- Hierarchy of interests of, heightened scrutiny and, § 4:19
- Johans decision, § 4:27.60
- Legal Services v. Velazquez, funding of legal services, § 19:25
- Monuments in public parks as government speech, § 19:16.50
- Property, captive audience on, see **Captive Audience**
- Speech, public forum doctrines, §§ 8:1.10, 8:1.50
- Speech and the Establishment Clause, § 19:1.50
- Supreme Court decides: NEA v. Finley, § 19:21
- Uncertain future of arts funding, § 19:22
- Time, place, or manner standard applicable to content-neutral regulation of public forum: regulation must be narrowly tailored to serve significant government interest, § 8:39
- Narrowly tailored regulations in context of time, place, or manner does not mean least restrictive, § 8:41
- Significant interest, § 8:40
- Understanding the O'Brien test: important or substantial government interest, § 9:10

**GOVERNMENT—Cont'd**

- Use of racial speech by, and affirmative action, § 13:18
- Stigmatizing governmental speech, § 13:19
- Use of racial speech by, and affirmative action: benign use of racial speech by government, § 13:20
- Adarand Constructors v. Peña: overruling of Metro, § 13:22
- Metro Broadcasting decision, § 13:21
- Vs. speakers, multiple rationales to defend free speech and, § 2:38

**GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES**

- Banning political activity of some, § 18:4
- Colleges and universities, job duty test, § 18:8.70
- Contractors, bans on contributions by, § 16:20.10
- Defining speech of public concern
  - Generally, § 18:9
  - Conundrums posed by public concern standard, § 18:10
  - Labor union activity, § 18:12.50
  - Office policy criticism implicating public accountability questions, § 18:12
  - Rankin v. McPherson and relevancy principle, § 18:11
  - Speech critical of office policy implicating questions of public accountability, § 18:12
- Disciplining, for speech activity:
  - Pickering, Connick, and Waters cases
  - Generally, § 18:6
  - Defining speech of public concern, above
  - Disruptive speech (applying balancing test), below
  - Evolution of public concern/disruption test: Pickering and Connick, § 18:7
  - Religious objections to the performance of official duties, § 18:20.60

**GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES  
—Cont'd**

- Disciplining, for speech activity:
  - Pickering, Connick, and Waters cases—Cont'd
  - Speech not of public opinion concern, below
  - Waters v. Churchill: court refines framework, § 18:8
- Disruptive speech (applying balancing test)
  - Generally, § 18:16
  - Effect of importance of speech on Government's burden, § 18:18
  - Fostering esprit de corps and policy consensus, § 18:20
  - Government's burden increases with importance of the speech, § 18:18
  - Harmony, personal loyalty, and confidence, § 18:19
  - Importance of context, § 18:17
  - Religious objections to the performance of official duties, § 18:20.60
  - Religious symbols, § 18:20.50
  - Restriction on non-English language use in the workplace, § 18:21
- Duties, defining scope of job duties
  - Generally, §§ 18:8.60, 18:8.70
  - Colleges and universities, § 18:8.70
- Expert witnesses, bans on state employees serving as, § 18:23
- Forced political contributions, § 18:5.50
- Garcetti v. Ceballos decision, § 18:8.50
- Independent government contractors, § 18:3
- Job duty test
  - Generally, § 18:8.60
  - Colleges and universities, § 18:8.70
- Judicial testimony: Lane v. Franks, § 18:9.40

## INDEX

### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

#### —Cont'd

- Lane v. Franks , judicial testimony,  
§ 18:9.40
- Objections, religious, to performance  
of official duties, § 18:20.60
- Official duties, speech pursuant to,  
§ 18:8.50
- Overview: right/privilege revisited,  
§ 18:1
- Petitions clauses claims, § 18:24
- Political financing, see **Political  
Financing**
- Political patronage cases
  - Generally, § 18:2
  - Political speech and patronage  
cases, below
- Political speech and patronage cases
  - Generally, § 16:4
  - Branti v. Finkel, § 16:6
  - Elrod v. Burns, § 16:5
  - Heffernan v. City of Paterson, N.J.,  
§ 16:7.10
  - Rutan v. Republic Party of Illinois,  
§ 16:7
- Preclearance procedures for, in  
national security cases
  - Generally, § 15:24
  - Lower court decisions, § 15:26
  - Snepp decision, § 15:25
- Proving causation in government  
employee cases: Mt. Healthy  
standard, § 18:25
- Questions of law or fact, § 18:26
- Regulating honoraria and royalties  
from outside speaking and writ-  
ing engagements, § 18:5
- Religious speech and symbols
  - Disruptive speech, balancing test,  
§ 18:20.50
  - Objections to performance of  
official duties, § 18:20.60
- Requiring prior approval for articles  
and speeches on official matters,  
§ 18:22
- Social media posts, § 18:21.50
- Speech not of public opinion concern
  - Generally, § 18:13

### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

#### —Cont'd

- Speech not of public opinion concern
  - Cont'd
  - Office minutiae and personal  
grievances, § 18:15
  - Profanity and vulgarity, § 18:14
- Voluntary political contributions,  
restrictions, § 16:22

### GRADING POLICY AND STANDARDS

- Applications of academic freedom  
principle, § 17:34.50

### GRAND JURIES

- Emerging principle of unauthorized  
disclosure of truthful informa-  
tion by the press: Butterworth v.  
Smith decision, § 25:42

### GROUP LABEL

- See **Hate Speech**

### HAIR REGULATION

- In schools, § 17:16

### HALTER v. NEBRASKA

- Flag desecration issue in, § 11:11

### HARMONY

- Disciplining government employees  
for speech activity, when speech  
is disruptive (applying balancing  
test), § 18:19

### HARM PRINCIPLE

- As core principle in heightened  
scrutiny, § 4:15
- Hierarchy of governmental  
interests, § 4:19
- Physical harm, § 4:16
- Reactive harms, § 4:18
- Relational harms, § 4:17

### HARPER & ROW DECISION

- Tensions between intellectual prop-  
erty and First Amendment: free  
speech safety valve in, § 21:11

### HATE CRIME

- Federal legislation, § 11:5.50
- Wisconsin v. Mitchell as decision on,  
§ 11:5

## HATE SPEECH

- Beauharnais decision, historical background of group libel and Generally, § 12:6
- Analysis of Beauharnais, § 12:7
- Beauharnais and outmoded categorical approach to First Amendment jurisprudence, § 12:9
- Group libel, infliction of emotional distress, and individual libel compared, § 12:8
- Conflicts posed by, § 12:1
  - Conflicts posed by intolerant speech in society committed to tolerance, § 12:3
- Hate speech not an exception to First Amendment, § 12:4
- Meaning of, § 12:2
- Critical content theory in two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles and example of, § 11:24
- First Amendment principles governing regulation of
  - Generally, § 12:5
  - Historical background of group libel and Beauharnais decision. Beauharnais decision, above
  - Racist demonstrations and prior restraints: Skokie case, § 12:27
  - R.A.V. case, see **R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul**
  - Relevance of Brandenburg decision, § 12:10
  - Summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to, below
- Regulation on campuses. See **Education**
- Summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to
  - Generally, § 12:22
  - Content-neutral protection of persons or property, § 12:24
  - Discriminatory conduct, § 12:25
  - Fighting words doctrine, § 12:23
  - Penalty-enhancement statute: Mitchell decision, § 12:26

## HATE SPEECH—Cont'd

- University of Wisconsin litigation. See **Education**

## HAZLEWOOD v. KUHLMEIER

- Activities at high schools and elementary schools, § 17:10

## HEALTH CARE ACTIVITIES

- Commercial speech in context of professional services, § 20:32

## HECKLERS

- Applying Brandenburg standard and rights of, § 10:38

## HEFFERNAN v. CITY OF PATERSON, N.J.

- Political speech and government employees: discipline cases, § 16:7.10

## HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY

- See also **Heightened Scrutiny Forms; Heightened Scrutiny Methodology**
- Content-based regulation and symbolic speech and expressive conduct triggers same heightened scrutiny as other content-based regulation, § 11:8
- Content-based regulation triggering, § 2:67

## HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY FORMS

- Charitable donors, forced disclosure, § 4:32
- Civil rights enforcement
  - The 303 Creative decision, § 4:26.10
- Compelled speech
  - The 303 Creative decision, § 4:26.10
- Core principles, § 4:5
- Core principles: causation principle, § 4:20
  - Relationship to clear and present danger tradition, § 4:22
  - Relationship to least restrictive means test, § 4:21

## HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY FORMS

### —Cont'd

- Core principles: emotion principle, § 4:9
  - Cohen v. California decision, § 4:11
  - Hustler Magazine v. Falwell decision, § 4:12
  - Inroads on emotion principle, § 4:13
  - Protecting emotional as well as intellectual components of speech, § 4:10
- Core principles: harm principle, § 4:15
  - Hierarchy of governmental interests, § 4:19
  - Physical harm, § 4:16
  - Reactive harms, § 4:18
  - Relational harms, § 4:17
- Core principles: neutrality principle, § 4:6
  - All laws must be viewpoint-neutral, § 4:8
  - Mere opposition to idea not enough to justify abridgement of speech, § 4:7
- Core principles: precision principle, § 4:23
  - Central importance of precision in speech regulation, § 4:24
  - Relationship to overbreadth, vagueness, and least restrictive means doctrine, § 4:25
- Core principles: symbolism principle, § 4:14
- Forced commercial speech and the Glickman decision, § 4:27
- Forced speech
  - Absence of heavy commercial regulation, forced speech in absence of— United Foods ruling, § 4:27.50
  - Labor unions, § 4:26.50
  - Special problem, § 4:26
  - State bar associations, § 4:26.20
  - Union dues, § 4:29
- Foreign speakers, outside United States, § 4:30

## HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY FORMS

### —Cont'd

- Government speech, Johanns decision, § 4:27.60
- Public sector union dues and forced speech, § 4:29
- Sex offenders, identification cards, § 4:31
- Strict scrutiny as default standard for content-based regulation, § 4:1
- Strict scrutiny as default mode, § 4:2
- Strict scrutiny displaced by other forms of heightened scrutiny, § 4:3
- Strict scrutiny displaced by reduced scrutiny, § 4:4
- Student activity fees; the Southworth decision, § 4:28
- The 303 Creative decision
  - Civil rights enforcement, § 4:26.10
  - Compelled speech, § 4:26.10

## HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY METHODOLOGY

- Generally, §§ 2:12, 2:61
- Defining heightened scrutiny, § 2:62
- Permutations of heightened scrutiny, § 2:63

## HEPPS DECISION

- Defamation and requirement of false statement and fact, § 23:7

## HERBERT v. LANDO

- Reporter's privilege: developments since *Brazburg*, § 25:24

## HERNDON v. LOWRY

- Road to *Brandenburg* and, § 10:16

## HESS v. INDIANA

- Applying *Brandenburg* intent and imminence standard in, § 10:27

## HICKLIN TEST

- Prosecutions for obscenity, § 14:3
- Roth rejection of, § 14:10
- Use of, to censor serious literature, § 14:5

**HIERARCHY OF**

**GOVERNMENTAL  
INTERESTS**

Heightened scrutiny and, § 4:19

**HIGH SCHOOLS**

Activities at, *Hazlewood v. Kuhlmeier*, § 17:10

**HISTORY**

Abortion protest, see **Abortion Protest**

Clear and present danger test, § 10:2

FCC regulation of cable, § 27:6

First Amendment, see **First Amendment Background**

Group libel and *Beauharnais* decision, see **Beauharnais Decision**

Meaning of press clause: text of First Amendment and uncertain historical evidence, § 22:4

Obscene speech, see **Obscene Speech**

Of cable television, § 27:2

Of prior restraint, see **Prior Restraint**

Places historically dedicated to free expression, § 8:4

**HOBBIE v. UNEMPLOYMENT  
APPEALS COMMISSION**

Unconstitutional conditions doctrine: special note on unemployment compensation cases, § 7:11

**HOME**

Privacy in, see **Captive Audience**

Privacy of, current obscenity standards and, see *Stanley v. Georgia*

**HONORARIA**

Regulating honoraria and royalties from outside speaking and writing engagements by government employees, § 18:5

**HOSTILE AUDIENCES**

Applying *Brandenburg* standard and rights of, § 10:39

**HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT CASES**

Education, schools, § 17:17.50

**HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT CASES  
—Cont'd**

In employment discrimination, see **Employment Discrimination**

**HUMAN DIGNITY AND  
SELF-FULFILLMENT  
THEORY**

Freedom of speech as end in itself, § 2:21

Of free speech, generally, § 2:5

**HUSTLER MAGAZINE v.  
FALWELL**

Emotion principle in, § 4:12

Infliction of emotional distress and, § 24:9

Hustler background, § 24:10

Hustler opinion, § 24:11

**IBANEZ DECISION**

Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by accountants and other professional services, § 20:36

**IDEA-EXPRESSION**

Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment and balance between, § 21:5

Justified balancing in favor of free speech in wedding of, § 21:8

**IDEA(S)**

See also **Free speech; and entries beginning with term: Content**

Mere opposition to, not enough to justify abridgement of speech, § 4:7

**IDENTIFICATION CARDS**

Sex offenders, § 4:31

**IDENTITY**

Crawford decision, challenges to “Voter ID” laws, § 16:40

Privacy and identity theft, § 24:19

**ILLEGAL ACTIVITY**

Application of commercial speech doctrines in regulating speech involving, § 20:16

## INDEX

### IMAGE

Distinguishing between gag orders furthering administration of justice and orders protecting, of courts and judges, § 15:42

### IMMINENCE

Intent and, see **Intent and Imminence Standard**

### IMMINENT HARM

Applying immediacy and likelihood requirements of Brandenburg standard, § 10:30

### IMMINENT LAWLESS ACTION

Clear and present danger of violence and, see **Clear and Present Danger Test**

### IMPERSONATION

Content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, § 3:7.60

### IMPRESARIO

Government as arts, see **Government**

### INCIDENT CONTENT-NEUTRAL REGULATIONS

See **United States v. O'Brien standard**

### INCUMBENTS

Protection laws, § 16:35.10  
“Resign to run” laws, § 16:35

### INDECENCY

Content-based regulation of cable television, § 27:13  
Cable operators’ self-imposed prohibitions on, § 27:15  
Scrambling and blocking, § 27:14  
Obscenity and, see **Obscenity**  
Overview of public, § 14:2

### INDEPENDENT CANDIDATES

Regulation of elections and, § 16:28

### INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

Speech rights, § 18:3

### INFORMAL PRESSURE

Prior restraints and current obscenity standards: use of informal pressure to censor adult material, § 14:63

### INFORMATIONAL PRIVACY

Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment: policy and, § 21:4.50

### INFORMED CONSENT

Commercial speech, § 20:32.10

### INJUNCTION

Intellectual property, copyright infringement on Internet, § 21:14  
Symbolic speech (and expressive conduct), “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:28

### INJURY

Abortion protest and prohibited intent to bring, § 13:29

### INNUENDO

Distinguishing unprotected insult and innuendo from protected speech, § 13:8  
See also **Employment Discrimination**

### INSTITUTIONS

Press access to, see **Newsgathering**

### INSULT

Distinguishing unprotected insult and innuendo from protected speech, § 13:8  
See also **Employment Discrimination**

### INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, § 21:12.50  
Cybersquatting, § 21:12.50  
Definitional balance  
Generally, § 21:3  
Balance based on idea-expression dichotomy, § 21:5  
Competing interests, § 21:4

## INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

### —Cont'd

Definitional balance—Cont'd

Justified balancing in favor of free speech, § 21:6

Justified balancing in favor of free speech: copyright duration, § 21:7

Justified balancing in favor of free speech: wedding of idea and expression, § 21:8

Privacy, constitutional right to informational privacy, § 21:4.50

Unjustified balancing in favor of free speech, § 21:9

Fair use: free speech safety valve, § 21:10

Fair use and parody, § 21:12

Harper & Row decision, § 21:11

Internet and copyright infringement, § 21:14

Prior restraint applied in, § 15:60

Privacy of information, constitutional right to, § 21:4.50

Religious disputes and, § 21:13

Tensions between the amendment and, § 21:1

Appropriate definitional balance. Definitional balance, above

Philosophical and policy paradox, § 21:2

Trademarks, offensive or disparaging, § 21:16

## INTENT

Determining whether facility is nonforum: Supreme court emphasis on, § 8:14

Imminence and, see **Intent and Imminence Standard**

Requirement of, in applying Brandenburg standard, § 10:34

## INTENT AND IMMINENCE STANDARD

Applying Brandenburg standard: immediacy and likelihood requirements, § 10:29

Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine, § 10:30

## INTENT AND IMMINENCE STANDARD—Cont'd

Applying Brandenburg standard: immediacy and likelihood requirements, § 10:29—Cont'd

Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine in Chaplinsky case, § 10:32

Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine in Chaplinsky case: modification of Chaplinsky fighting words concept, § 10:33

Importance of demonstrating imminent harm, § 10:30

In Brandenburg, § 10:21

Bond and Watts decisions, § 10:22

In Brandenburg: applying the standard, § 10:26

Applied in *Hess v. Indiana*, § 10:27

Claiborne Hardware decision, § 10:28

In Brandenburg: the decision, § 10:23

Brandenburg test a version of clear and present danger test, § 10:25

Facts and holding, § 10:24

In Counterman decision

True threats, § 10:22.60

“True threats,” § 10:22.70

True threats

The Counterman decision, § 10:22.60

“True threats,” § 10:22.50

The Counterman decision, § 10:22.70

## INTERCEPTED ELECTRONIC MATERIAL

*Barnticki v. Vopper*, illegal interception, § 25:45.50

## INTERFERE

Abortion protest and prohibited intent to, § 13:29

## INTERMEDIATE SCRUTINY

Requirement of substantial relationship, in interpreting *O'Brien* test, § 9:17

## INDEX

### INTERNET

- Anonymous speech online, § 27:19.50
- Child Online Protection Act, § 27:22.50
- Community standards and: Ashcroft v. ACLU, § 14:66
- Content decision regulation, § 8:33.21
- Copyright
  - Infringement, § 21:14
  - Preemption, § 21:15
- Domain names, § 27:25
- Filtering software, § 27:22.75
- Free speech on, § 27:17
  - ACLU v. Reno decision, § 27:21
  - Anonymous speech online, § 27:19.50
  - Communications Decency Act, § 27:20
  - On-line communication, § 27:18
  - Regulation of internet, generally, §§ 27:19, 27:20 to 27:22
- Lawyer blogs, specific contexts of professional services, § 20:31.30
- Pop-up advertising, § 27:26
- Public forum doctrines, websites, § 8:33.20
- Restricting research on, § 17:39
- School-related off-campus Internet posting, disciplining student for, § 17:4.70
- Social media accounts, public office-holders, § 8:33.25
- Supreme Court's decision in Reno v. ACLU, § 27:22

### INTIMIDATION

- Abortion protest and prohibited intent to, § 13:29
- Civil rights enforcement and, § 13:23

### INTRUSION

- First Amendment and privacy, § 24:6

### JOHANNIS DECISION

- Compelled speech, § 19:25.50
- Government speech, §§ 4:27.60, 20:45.60

### JOHNSON DECISION

- Flag desecration and, see **Flag Desecration Cases**

### JOURNALISTIC INDEPENDENCE

- Cases involving greater First Amendment restraints on newsroom searches and subpoenas and pressures on, § 25:33

### JUDGES

- Commercial speech, § 20:31.45
- Contempt sanctions against, judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:50.50
- First Amendment protection for statements in judicial opinions, § 16:32.60
- Judicial Candidates** (this index)
- Speech regulation, § 20:31.45

### JUDICIAL CANDIDATES

- Bans on contribution solicitation, Williams-Yulee v. The Florida Bar, § 16:32.55
- Limiting speech of, Republican Party v. White, § 16:32.50

### JUDICIAL OFFICERS

- Political affiliation, § 16:7.20

### JUDICIAL OPINIONS

- First Amendment protection for statements in judicial opinions, § 16:32.60

### JUDICIAL REVIEW

- Prior restraints, current and obscenity standards and requirement of immediate, § 14:57

### JUDITH MILLER LITIGATION DECISION

- Newsgathering (First Amendment protection), § 25:26.50

### JURISPRUDENCE

- Distinguishing free speech theory, method, and doctrine in modern, § 2:1
- General principles of modern First Amendment, and reporter's

**JURISPRUDENCE—Cont’d**  
privilege, §§ 25:27, 25:27.50

**JURORS**

Nebraska Press standard presumption against gag order and protecting identity of, § 15:36  
Press access to criminal judicial proceedings and information concerning, § 25:9  
Restraints involving, judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:50

**JUSTICIABILITY DOCTRINES**

First amendment, § 6:17

**JUVENILE PROCEEDINGS**

Nebraska Press standard presumption against gag order and cases affecting privacy of children, § 15:33  
Press access to, § 25:11

**KOBE BRYANT DECISION**

Prior restraint, protecting the privacy of rape victims, § 15:33.50

**LABOR LEGISLATION**

Press and, §§ 22:21, 22:24

**LABOR UNIONS**

Disciplining government employees for speech activity, defining speech of public concern, § 18:12.50  
Forced speech and union dues, § 4:29  
Heightened scrutiny forms, forced speech, § 4:26.50  
Political expenditures: Citizens United v. Federal Election Com’n decision, § 16:19

**LADUE v. GILLES**

Eliminating an entire medium of expression, § 8:50

**LANDMARK COMMUNICATIONS DECISION**

Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press, § 25:41

**LANE v. FRANKS**

Government employees, judicial testimony, § 18:9.40

**LANGUAGE**

Disciplining government employees for speech activity, when speech is disruptive (applying balancing test): restriction on non-English language use in the workplace, § 18:21  
Freedom of speech encompasses communication through symbols and actions other than the use of, § 11:2  
Inviting, text of First Amendment, § 22:3  
No immunity in all use of, § 2:51

**LAW ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS**

Content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation of speech, impersonation, § 3:7.60

**“LAWFULLY OBTAINED” INFORMATION**

Newsgathering (First Amendment protection), *Barntick v. Vopper*, § 25:45.60

**LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEANS**

Precision principle in heightened scrutiny and relationship to, § 4:25  
Relationship to, causation principle in heightened scrutiny and, § 4:21  
Understanding the O’Brien test, prong four: restriction must be “no greater than is essential,” § 9:15  
Interpretation of prong four: intermediate scrutiny requirement of substantial relationship, § 9:17  
Prong four does not incorporate least restrictive means test, § 9:16

**LEGAL PROFESSIONALS**

Directories that sell advertising, § 20:31.40

## INDEX

### **LEGAL PROFESSIONALS—Cont'd**

Speech concerning the legal system;  
regulation of, § 20:37.60

### **LEGAL SERVICES v. VELAZQUEZ**

Government, funding of legal services, § 19:25

### **LEGISLATION**

Patently offensive sexual material  
defined by specific, § 14:27

### **LEHMAN DECISION**

Captive audience on government  
property, § 5:14  
Reconciling Pollack and Lehman:  
making sense of captive audience  
principle, § 5:15

### **LEVIN DECISION**

Taking controversial or politically  
incorrect positions, § 17:38

### **LIBEL**

Creation of First Amendment standards for, § 23:1  
See also **Defamation**  
Actual malice standard, § 23:3  
Facts and holding of New York  
Times case, § 23:2  
Government, no libel against,  
§ 23:3.50  
Enforcement of foreign libel judgments, § 23:14  
Group, see **Hate Speech**  
Regulation of speech of candidates:  
political campaigns and laws on,  
§ 16:34

### **LIBERTARIANISM**

Harm principle and, § 2:24

### **LIBRARIES**

As forums, § 8:31  
Funding of, by government, § 19:22  
School, § 17:5  
Lower court decisions, § 17:7  
Pico decision, § 17:6

### **LICENSE PLATES**

Public forum doctrines, § 8:33.10  
Sons of Confederate Veterans license  
plate case, defining government

### **LICENSE PLATES—Cont'd**

speech, § 19:2.50

### **LICENSES**

Education, requirement challenges,  
§ 17:44

### **LICENSING AUTHORITY**

Procedural issues concerning prior  
restraints: Freedman requirements:  
burden of licensing authority, § 15:67

### **LICENSING PROCEDURES**

Prior restraints in obscenity cases:  
application of current obscenity  
standards, § 14:59

### **LIQUOR**

Government using speech regulation  
to discourage use of, § 20:19

### **LITERATURE**

Distribution of anonymous political,  
§ 16:37

### **LITERATURE TEST**

Use of Hicklin test to censor serious  
literature, § 14:5

### **LITIGATION**

Gag orders on participants in, see  
**Prior Restraint**

### **LOANS**

Candidates to campaigns, political  
financing, § 16:21.30

### **LOBBYISTS**

Gifts and contributions, § 16:20.20  
Volunteer lobbyists, § 16:20.30

### **LOCAL AND STATE LAWS**

Understanding the O'Brien test,  
prong one as constitutional  
power application to, § 9:9

### **LOYALTY OATHS**

Regulation of elections and, § 16:29

### **MADSEN v. WOMEN'S HEALTH CENTER**

No protection for use of force, threat  
of force, physical obstruction, or  
damage to property in, § 13:37

**MADSEN v. WOMEN'S HEALTH CENTER—Cont'd**

Picketing of abortion clinics, § 13:37

**MAIL**

Blocking unwanted mail when addressee initiates blocking, § 5:6

Blocking unwanted mail when government initiates blocking, § 5:7

**MAJORITY RULE**

Free speech contribution to facilitating, § 2:32

**MALICE**

Creation of First Amendment standards for libel, actual malice, § 23:3

**MANNER**

Applicable standard to content-neutral regulation of public forum, see **Time, Place, or Manner Standard**

**MARCHING**

Restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:53

Limits on picketing and public demonstrations, § 15:54

Picketing of abortion clinics: Madsen decision, § 15:55

**MARKETPLACE**

Captive audience and general rule of: burden on viewers to avert their eyes, § 5:2

Rationales for requiring offended viewers to avert their eyes, § 5:3

**MARKETPLACE OF IDEAS THEORY**

Generally, §§ 2:4, 2:14

Analytic underpinnings of, § 2:16

Critiques of the theory, § 2:17

Distinguishing process from the result, § 2:18

Marketplace and value of open process, § 2:19

**MARKETPLACE OF IDEAS THEORY—Cont'd**

Analytic underpinnings of, § 2:16  
—Cont'd

Open markets and open minds, § 2:20

Poetic power of marketplace metaphor, § 2:15

**MASTURBATION**

Patently offensive depictions or descriptions, Miller test, § 14:31

**MATCHING FUNDS**

Leveling the playing field: Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club Pac v. Bennett decision, § 16:21.50

**McCULLEN v. COAKLEY**

Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act of 1994: Peaceful abortion protest is protected speech, § 13:38.50

**McCUTCHEON DECISION**

Regulation of political financing, § 16:14.80

**MCFL DECISION**

Corporate political speech protected, § 16:16

**MEDIA**

Broadcast, see **Broadcast Regulation; Broadcast Television**

Cable, see **Cable Television**

Electronic: free speech on the internet, § 27:17

Anonymous speech online, § 27:19.50

On-line communication, § 27:18

First Amendment ban on discrimination among different, § 22:19

Lessons of Turner Broadcasting, § 22:20

Newsgathering by, see **Newsgathering**

Press clause, see **Press Clause**

**MEDIUM OF EXPRESSION**

Eliminating an entire medium of expression: Ladue v. Gilleo, § 8:50

## INDEX

### **MEESE v. KEENE**

- Philosophical issues posed in government as propagandist in, § 19:5
- Critical view of the case, § 19:7
- Holding in the case, § 19:6

### **MEMOIRS**

- Gloss on Roth, obscene speech and, § 14:16

### **MERGENS DECISION**

- Clubs and organizations meeting after school, § 8:22

### **MESSAGE**

- Content, see entries beginning with terms: **Content**

### **METRO BROADCASTING DECISION**

- Benign use of racial speech by government and *Adarand Constructors v. Pena* overruling, § 13:22
- Governmental use of racial speech and affirmative action and, § 13:21

### **METROMEDIA DECISION**

- Commercial speech in context of regulation for aesthetic or environmental purposes: singling out commercial speech, § 20:41

### **MIAMI HERALD DECISION**

- Access by the public to institutional press: print model, § 25:47

### **MILITARY BASES**

- As forums, § 8:29
- Prior restraint in national security cases: restrictions on distribution of material on, § 15:23

### **MILITARY CAMPAIGNS**

- Press access to, § 25:15

### **MILKOVICH HOLDING (MILKOVICH v. LORAIN JOURNAL)**

- Defamation and, § 23:11

### **MILLER TEST**

- Established, § 14:19
  - Holding of Miller, § 14:20
  - First prong: prurient interest, § 14:21
    - Community standard applies, § 14:23
    - Depiction must be sexual, § 14:22
  - Historical overview of freedom of speech and: developments from Roth and, see Roth v. United States
  - Second prong: patently offensive material, § 14:24
    - Defined by applicable law, § 14:25
    - Defined by applicable law: only hard-core depictions or descriptions may be proscribed, § 14:27
    - Defined by applicable law: specific legislative definition, § 14:26
  - Patently offensive depictions or descriptions, § 14:28
  - Patently offensive depictions or descriptions: masturbation, excretory functions, and exhibition of genitals, § 14:30
  - Patently offensive depictions or descriptions: ultimate sexual acts, § 14:29
  - Patent offensiveness defined by community standards, § 14:31
  - Patent offensiveness distinguished from normal sexual depictions, § 14:32
  - Third prong: serious redeeming value, § 14:33
    - “Obscene” speech not equated with “violent” speech, § 14:35.50
  - Redeeming value must be serious, § 14:34
  - Redeeming value not determined by community standards, § 14:35
- ### **“MILLIONAIRES AMENDMENT” DECISION**
- Political processes and elections, candidate’s right to spend own money, § 16:21

**MILLS v. ALABAMA**

Regulation of political processes and,  
§ 16:24

**MINORS**

Child pornography, see **Child  
Pornography**

Clear and present danger, restricting  
access of children to violent  
material, § 10:36.50

Morphed child pornography,  
§ 14:52.60

Nebraska Press standard presumption  
against gag order and cases  
affecting privacy of, § 15:33

Pacifica ruling and related issue of  
sheltering children from  
offensive speech, § 5:9

Obscenity and indecency: content  
regulation of broadcast in  
Pacifica decision: influence on  
children rationale, § 26:23

Proceedings, see **Juvenile Proceed-  
ings**

Restricting exposure to, child  
pornography and, § 14:53

Sending sexually explicit messages,  
§ 14:52.80

Sexually explicit messages, sending,  
§ 14:52.80

Student speech, university  
distinguished from secondary  
and pre-secondary students,  
§ 17:2.50

**MISLEADING ACTIVITIES**

Application of commercial speech  
doctrines in regulating speech  
involving illegal or false and,  
§ 20:13

Distinguishing inherently mislead-  
ing from potentially mislead-  
ing advertising, § 20:15

**MITCHELL DECISION**

Applied to abortion protest: no  
protection for use of force,  
threat of force, physical obstruc-  
tion, or damage to property:  
applying R.A.V. and Mitchell  
rulings, § 13:36

**MITCHELL DECISION—Cont'd**

Summary of First Amendment  
doctrines applicable to hate  
speech: penalty-enhancement  
statute and, § 12:26

**MONUMENTS IN PUBLIC PARKS**

Government speech, § 19:16.50

**MORSE V. FREDERICK**

School-sanctioned events, the “Bong  
Hits 4 Jesus” case, § 17:4.50

**MT. HEALTHY STANDARD**

Proving causation in government  
employee cases, § 18:25

**MULTIPLE JUSTIFICATIONS  
APPROACH**

Of free speech, generally, § 2:7  
See also **Free Speech**

**NARROW CONSTRUCTION  
TECHNIQUE**

Saving overbroad laws through, § 6:8

Narrowing construction and fair  
warning requirement, § 6:10

Narrowing construction technique,  
§ 6:9

**NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR  
THE ARTS**

Funding the arts and, see **Funding  
the Arts**

**NATIONAL SECURITY**

Criminal prosecution for publishing  
leaked classified national secu-  
rity information, § 25:45.70

Prior restraints and, see **Prior  
Restraint**

**“NATIONAL SECURITY  
LETTERS”**

Prior restraint ,non-disclosure  
requirements, § 15:22.50

**NEAR v. MINNESOTA**

Contemporary history of prior  
restraint, § 15:4

Prior restraint for reasons of national  
security and dicta in, § 15:12

## INDEX

### NEBRASKA PRESS DECISION

Contemporary history of prior restraint, § 15:6

### NEBRASKA PRESS STANDARD

Judicial proceedings and application of the standard: Noriega tapes litigation, § 15:37

Critique of Noriega decision, § 15:39

Facts of the tapes disputes, § 15:38

Judicial proceedings and application of the standard: presumption against gag order, § 15:31

Indirect burdens on press coverage, § 15:34

Influence of concurring opinions, § 15:32

Juvenile proceedings and cases affecting privacy of children, § 15:33

Protecting identity of jurors, § 15:36

Restraints on information about judicial proceedings gathered through independent sources, § 15:35

Prior restraint, § 15:29

Judicial proceedings and application of the standard, § 15:30

### NEUTRALITY PRINCIPLE

As core principle in heightened scrutiny, § 4:6

All laws must be viewpoint-neutral, § 4:8

Mere opposition to idea not enough to justify abridgement of speech, § 4:7

Government as speech financier: policy and doctrinal tensions and, § 19:10

### NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS v. CARRIGAN

Ethics and recusal restrictions, § 16:36.50

### NEWS AGGREGATOR

Intellectual property, copyright preemption, § 21:15

### NEWSGATHERING (FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION)

Access by the public to institutional press, § 25:46

Broadcast model: Red Lion decision, § 25:48

Print model: Miami Herald decision, § 25:47

Arbitration proceedings, press access to information, institutions, and events, § 25:12.50

Criminal prosecution for publishing national security information, § 25:45.70

Electronic device bans, courtrooms, § 25:7.50

Intercepted electronic material (illegal interception), *Barnticki v. Vopper*, § 25:45.50

Judith Miller Litigation, § 25:26.50

“Lawfully obtained” information, *Barnticki v. Vopper*, § 25:45.60

Media: “ride-alongs,” § 25:37.50

National security information, publishing, § 25:45.70

Newsroom searches and subpoenas, § 25:29

Search warrants, § 25:30

Statutory and regulatory restraints, § 25:32

Subpoenas, § 25:31

Newsroom searches and subpoenas: case for evolving greater First Amendment restraints on searches and subpoenas, § 25:33

Material generated by the press, § 25:37

Pressures on journalistic independence, § 25:34

Program for the future, § 25:35

Search warrants and subpoenas, § 25:36

Press access outside judicial proceedings, § 25:13

Access to military campaigns, § 25:15

Burial of military personnel, § 25:16

Prison visitation cases, § 25:14

**NEWSGATHERING (FIRST  
AMENDMENT PROTECTION)**

**—Cont'd**

- Press access to criminal judicial proceedings, § 25:2
- Access to court documents and exhibits, § 25:8
- Communicating in camera in chambers, § 25:10
- Historic Richmond Newspapers decision, § 25:3
- Information concerning jurors, § 25:9
- Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: developments after Richmond Newspapers decision, § 25:4
- Globe Newspaper Co. v. Superior Court, § 25:5
- Press-Enterprise I, § 25:6
- Press-Enterprise II, § 25:7
- Press access to information, institutions, and events, § 25:1
- Arbitration proceedings, § 25:12.50
- Civil judicial proceedings, § 25:12
- Press access to juvenile proceedings, § 25:11
- Press access to judicial proceedings
- Limiting phones and electronic devices inside courtrooms, § 25:7.50
- Public interest group's surveillance cameras, removal from public parkland, § 25:16.50
- Removal of surveillance cameras from public parkland, § 25:16.50
- Reporter's privilege, § 25:17
- General principles of modern First Amendment jurisprudence and reporter's privilege, §§ 25:27, 25:27.50
- Invoking reporter's privilege, § 25:27.50
- Liability for disclosing name of confidential source: Cohen decision, § 25:28
- Sources of the privilege: shield statutes, common law, and the

**NEWSGATHERING (FIRST  
AMENDMENT PROTECTION)**

**—Cont'd**

- Reporter's privilege, § 25:17
  - Cont'd
  - First Amendment, § 25:18
  - Reporter's privilege: ambiguous ruling in Branzburg v. Hayes, § 25:19
  - Dissents, § 25:21
  - Majority opinion, § 25:20
  - Pivotal concurring opinion of Justice Powell, § 25:22
  - Reporter's privilege: developments since Branzburg, § 25:23
  - Lower court decisions, § 25:26
  - Relevance of Herbert v. Lando, § 25:24
  - University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC dictum, § 25:25
  - Restrictions on reporting truthful information, § 25:38
  - Restrictions on reporting truthful information: emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press, § 25:39
  - Applications of the principle, § 25:45
  - Attorney disciplinary proceedings, § 25:43.50
  - Grand juries: Butterworth v. Smith decision, § 25:42
  - Landmark Communications decision, § 25:41
  - Prior restraints and Pentagon Papers decision, § 25:40
  - Public records and privacy decisions, § 25:43
  - Synthesis of contours of emerging principle, § 25:44
  - School newspapers, § 17:10.50
  - Trafficking in truthful information, Bartnicki v. Vopper, § 25:45.60
- NEW YORK TIMES DECISION**
- Facts and holding of, § 23:2
- NOISE REGULATIONS**
- Permissible time, place, or manner regulations to control with, § 8:46

## INDEX

### **NOMINATIONS**

Regulation of political processes and: campaigns, primaries, elections, and parties, nominating conventions, § **16:30.50**

### **NONDESTRUCTIVE PROTEST**

Abortion, § **13:33**

See also **Public Forum Doctrines**

### **NONOBSCENE NONSEXUAL PUBLIC VULGARITY**

Application of current obscenity standards to: attempts to restrict, § **14:43**

### **NONOBSTRUCTING PROTEST**

Abortion, § **13:33**

See also **Abortion Protest**

### **NONPROFIT ADVOCACY GROUPS**

Federal Election Commission v. Beaumont, political processes and elections, § **16:20**

### **NONSCHOOL-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES**

Of publications and theatrical presentations in schools, § **17:13**

### **NONVIOLENT PROTEST**

Abortion, § **13:33**

See also **Abortion Protest**

### **NORIEGA TAPES LITIGATION**

Nebraska Press standard, § **15:37**  
Critique of Noriega decision, § **15:39**

Facts of the tapes disputes, § **15:38**

### **NOTO DECISION**

Distinguishing between advocacy and action in, § **10:19**

### **NUDE DANCING**

Application of current obscenity standards to, § **14:40**

Critical content theory in two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles and example of, § **11:23**

### **NUDE DANCING—Cont'd**

Understanding the O'Brien test: case study in application of suppression of free expression in problem of, § **9:14**

### **NUISANCE STATUTES**

Prior restraints and, obscenity standards and, § **14:62**

### **OATHS**

Regulation of elections and loyalty, § **16:29**

### **O'BRIEN TEST**

See *United States v. O'Brien* standard

### **OBSCENE (AND PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH**

Adult bookstores, theatres, dance clubs, and similar activities

Generally, § **14:37**

Attempts to restrict nonobscene nonsexual public vulgarity, § **14:43**

Conditions on public funds: the NEA litigation, § **14:42**

Dial-a-porn, § **14:41**

Regulation of nude dancing, § **14:40**

Significance of *Paris Adult Theatre I* decision, § **14:38**

Use of zoning laws to regulate nonobscene adult entertainments, § **14:39**

Application of current obscenity standards

Generally, § **14:36**

Adult bookstores, theaters, dance clubs, and similar activities, above

Attempts to ban pornography on the theory that it constitutes sex discrimination, § **14:54**

Child pornography, below

Prior restraints in obscenity cases, below

Private possession, see **Private Possession of Obscene Material**

**OBSCENE (AND  
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH**

**—Cont'd**

- Ashcroft v. ACLU , community standards and internet, § **14:66**
- Child pornography
  - Generally, § **14:50**
  - Banning use of children as subjects, § **14:51**
  - Dirty pixels: virtual child pornography, § **14:52.50**
  - Morphed child pornography, § **14:52.60**
  - Pandering or soliciting, real or simulated, § **14:52.70**
  - Private possession of child pornography may be banned, § **14:52**
  - Restricting exposure to minors, § **14:53**
  - U.S. v. Williams holding, § **14:52.70**
- Children, sending sexually explicit messages to minors, § **14:52.80**
- Communications Decency Act of 1996, cross-reference to, § **14:65**
- Community standards and Internet: Ashcroft v. ACLU, § **14:66**
- Historical overview of freedom of speech and, § **14:1**
  - Public indecency, § **14:2**
- Historical overview of freedom of speech and: development of prosecutions for obscenity, § **14:3**
  - Hicklin test, § **14:4**
  - Use of Hicklin to censor serious literature, § **14:5**
- Historical overview of freedom of speech and: developments from Roth and Miller, § **14:12**
  - Independent appellate review principle, § **14:14**
  - Scienter requirement, § **14:13**
  - Supreme Court's per curiam period, § **14:15**
  - Supreme Court's per curiam period: Ginzburg and pandering concept, § **14:17**

**OBSCENE (AND  
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH**

**—Cont'd**

- Historical overview of freedom of speech and: developments from Roth and Miller, § **14:12**
  - Cont'd
  - Supreme Court's per curiam period: Memoirs gloss on Roth, § **14:16**
  - Supreme Court's per curiam period: per curiam parade, § **14:18**
- Historical overview of freedom of speech and: Supreme Court decision in Roth v. United States, § **14:6**
  - Justices Douglas and Black dissent, § **14:11**
  - Link between Roth and Chaplinsky, § **14:8**
  - Not all sexual speech is obscene: Roth and prurient interest standard, § **14:9**
  - Obscenity not protected by First Amendment, § **14:7**
  - Roth rejection of Hicklin test, § **14:10**
- Internet, community standards and: Ashcroft v. ACLU, § **14:66**
- Messages to minors, sending sexually explicit, § **14:52.80**
- Minors, sending sexually explicit messages, § **14:52.80**
- Morphed child pornography, § **14:52.60**
- Online computer networks and obscenity: United States v. Thomas, § **14:64**
  - Cross-reference to Communications Decency Act of 1996, § **14:65**
- Prior restraints in obscenity cases
  - Generally, § **14:56**
  - Forfeitures under RICO provisions: the Alexander decision, § **14:61**
  - Freedman v. Maryland requirements, § **14:58**

**OBSCENE (AND  
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH**

**—Cont'd**

- Prior restraints in obscenity cases
  - Cont'd
  - Other procedural safeguards: licensing procedures, § 14:59
  - Other procedural safeguards: seizures of allegedly obscene material, § 14:60
  - Prior restraints and nuisance statutes, § 14:62
  - Requirement of immediate judicial review, § 14:57
  - Use of informal pressure to censor adult material, § 14:63
- Prisons, restricting sexual materials in prisons, § 14:42.50
- Requiring health warnings regarding perceived dangers of viewing online pornography, § 14:67
- Restrictions on drag performances, § 14:40.50
- Revenge porn, § 14:49.50
- Sending sexually explicit messages to minors, § 14:52.80
- Test established in *Miller v. California*, § 14:19
  - Holding of *Miller*, § 14:20
- Test established in *Miller v. California*: first prong: prurient interest, § 14:21
  - Community standard applies, § 14:23
  - Depiction must be sexual, § 14:22
- Test established in *Miller v. California*: second prong: patently offensive material, § 14:24
  - Defined by applicable law, § 14:25
  - Defined by applicable law: only hard-core depictions or descriptions may be proscribed, § 14:27
  - Defined by applicable law: specific legislative definition, § 14:26
  - Patently offensive depictions or descriptions, § 14:28
  - Patently offensive depictions or descriptions: masturbation, excretory functions, and exhi-

**OBSCENE (AND  
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH**

**—Cont'd**

- Test established in *Miller v. California*: second prong: patently offensive material, § 14:24
  - Cont'd
  - hibition of genitals, § 14:30
- Patently offensive depictions or descriptions: ultimate sexual acts, § 14:29
- Patent offensiveness defined by community standards, § 14:31
- Patent offensiveness distinguished from normal sexual depictions, § 14:32
- Test established in *Miller v. California*: third prong: serious redeeming value, § 14:33
  - Redeeming value must be serious, § 14:34
  - Redeeming value not determined by community standards, § 14:35
  - “Violent” speech not equated with “obscene” speech, § 14:35.50
- Theaters. Adult bookstores, theaters, dance clubs, and similar activities, above
- “Violent” speech not equated with “obscene” speech, § 14:35.50

**OBSCENITY**

- Content regulation of broadcasts and, § 26:17
- Indecency and, content regulation of broadcast and, § 26:17
  - Action for Children’s Television litigation, § 26:26
- Challenges to FCC’s regulation of “fleeting expletives” as indecency, § 26:28
- Developments since *Sable*, § 26:25
- Limits on *Pacifica*: *Sable* ruling, § 26:24
- Obscenity, § 26:18
- Indecency and, content regulation of broadcast and *Pacifica* decision, § 26:19
- Indecent but not obscene, § 26:20

**OBSCENITY—Cont’d**

Indecency and, content regulation of  
broadcast and Pacifica decision,  
§ 26:19—Cont’d

Influence on children rationale,  
§ 26:23

Pacifica and reduced protection for  
broadcasting, § 26:21

Persuasiveness rationale, § 26:22

Speech, see **Obscene (and  
Pornographic) Speech**

**“OCCUPY WALL STREET” AND  
OTHER “OCCUPY  
MOVEMENT” ISSUES**

See **Symbolic Speech**

**OFFENSIVE SPEECH**

Principles of, whether marketplace,  
apply in workplace, see  
**Employment Discrimination**

Speech causing dysfunction in  
workplace distinguished from  
merely, § 13:9

Standards of, whether offensive  
speech principles applicable in  
marketplace apply to speech in  
the workplace and concerns  
relating to, § 13:11

Trademarks, § 21:16

**OFFICE MINUTIAE**

Disciplining government employees  
for speech activity, speech not of  
public concern, § 18:15

**OFF-LABEL DRUG PROMOTION  
AND MARKETING**

Commercial speech, specific contexts  
of professional services,  
§ 20:32.60

**OHRALIK DECISION**

Commercial speech in context of  
advertising and solicitation by  
attorneys, § 20:29

**ONLINE COMMUNICATION**

Generally, § 27:18

Anonymous speech online,  
§ 27:19.50

**ONLINE COMMUNICATION  
—Cont’d**

Government employees, social media  
posts, § 18:21.50

On-line defamation and Section 230  
of the Communications Decency  
Act, § 23:12

Professional directories that sell  
advertising, § 20:31.40

Sexually explicit material, restricting  
access to via government  
computers, § 27:23

Social media posts by government  
employees, § 18:21.50

Violence and, § 10:42

The Portland “Nuremberg Files”  
Litigation, § 10:43

**ONLINE COMPUTER NETWORKS  
AND OBSCENITY**

Obscene (and pornographic) speech:  
United States v. Thomas,  
§§ 14:64, 14:65

**OPINION**

Defamation and protection of (or  
“nonfact”), § 23:9

Supreme Court’s holding in  
Milkovich v. Lorain Journal,  
§ 23:11

Traditional fact/opinion distinc-  
tion, § 23:10

**ORGANIZATIONS**

Meeting after school: Mergens and  
Good News Club decision,  
§ 8:22

**OVERBREADTH DOCTRINE**

Court’s refusal to invoke, as basis for  
its ruling in R.A.V., § 12:15

Precision principle in heightened  
scrutiny and relationship to,  
§ 4:25

Vagueness doctrine related to, see  
**Vagueness and Overbreadth  
Doctrines**

**OVERBREADTH EXCEPTION**

Application of commercial speech  
doctrines, § 20:11

## INDEX

### OVERBREADTH ISSUE

Freedom of Access Act and,  
§§ 13:39, 13:40

### OVERVIEW

Absolutism methodology, § 2:47  
Absolute principles embraced by  
First Amendment, § 2:54  
Absolutism rejected by Supreme  
Court, § 2:53  
Legacies of Justices Black and  
Douglas, § 2:48  
Rhetoric and reality among  
absolutists, § 2:49  
Absolutism methodology as too  
simplistic, § 2:50  
First Amendment no immunity in  
all use of language, § 2:51  
Spurious speech/conduct distinc-  
tion, § 2:52  
Ad hoc balancing methodology,  
§ 2:55  
Seductive appeal of ad hoc balanc-  
ing, § 2:57  
Supreme Court approach to ad hoc  
balancing, § 2:56  
Ad hoc balancing methodology's  
shortcomings, § 2:58  
Ad hoc balancing unfairly  
weighted in favor of legisla-  
tive judgments, § 2:60  
Low-predictive value chills free  
speech, § 2:59  
Clarity of terminology, § 2:2  
Current doctrine, § 2:64  
Circumstances where content-  
based speech regulation  
received reduced scrutiny,  
§ 2:68  
Content-based regulation trigger-  
ing heightened scrutiny,  
§ 2:67  
Content-neutral vs. content-based  
regulation of speech, § 2:66  
Limited modern examples of  
categorical approach, § 2:71  
Outdated categorical approach of  
Chaplinsky v. New  
Hampshire, § 2:70

### OVERVIEW—Cont'd

Current doctrine, § 2:64—Cont'd  
Overview of First Amendment  
doctrine, § 2:65  
Reduced scrutiny based on setting,  
§ 2:72  
Reduced scrutiny based on subject  
matter, § 2:69  
Right to receive information,  
§ 2:73  
Strict scrutiny, § 2:67.50  
Underinclusive laws, § 2:67.50  
Democratic self-governance, § 2:26  
Alexander Meiklejohn's influence,  
§ 2:28  
Free speech and democratic pro-  
cess, § 2:27  
Distinguishing theory, method, and  
doctrine in modern jurispru-  
dence on, § 2:1  
Doctrine of, § 2:13  
Heightened scrutiny methodology,  
§ 2:61  
Defining heightened scrutiny,  
§ 2:62  
Permutations of heightened  
scrutiny, § 2:63  
Human dignity and self-fulfillment:  
freedom of speech as end in  
itself, § 2:21  
Link between expression and  
personality, § 2:22  
Classic libertarianism and harm  
principle, § 2:24  
Distinguishing free expression  
from other forms of self-  
gratification, § 2:23  
Expression and thought, § 2:25  
Marketplace theory, § 2:14  
Poetic power of marketplace meta-  
phor, § 2:15  
Marketplace theory's analytic  
underpinnings, § 2:16  
Critiques of the theory, § 2:17  
Distinguishing process from the  
result, § 2:18  
Marketplace and value of open  
process, § 2:19

**OVERVIEW—Cont'd**

- Marketplace theory's analytic underpinnings, § 2:16—Cont'd
- Open markets and open minds, § 2:20
- Method of, § 2:9
  - Absolutism, § 2:10
  - Ad hoc balancing, § 2:11
  - Heightened scrutiny, § 2:12
- Multiple rationales to defend, § 2:37
  - Value of invoking multiple rationales, § 2:39
  - Who decides: government vs. speakers, § 2:38
- Multiple rationales to defend: First Amendment not limited to protection of political speech, § 2:40
- Supreme Court rejection of notion of the amendment limited to political speech, § 2:46
- Multiple rationales to defend: First Amendment not limited to protection of political speech: fallacy of limiting the amendment to political issues, § 2:41
- Importance does not equate exclusivity, § 2:42
- Limiting freedom of speech to politics as form of statism, § 2:45
- Political and nonpolitical inseparable, § 2:44
- Speech making life worth living, § 2:43
- Self-governance rationale in cases involving, § 2:29
- Self-governance theory as exclusive rationale, § 2:36
- Theory, § 2:3
  - Democratic self-governance theory, § 2:6
  - Human dignity and self-fulfillment theory, § 2:5
  - Importance of theory in practice, § 2:8
  - Marketplace of ideas theory, § 2:4
  - Multiple justifications approach, § 2:7

**OVERVIEW—Cont'd**

- Various contributions to democracy by, § 2:30
- Checking value and control of power abuse, § 2:31
- Facilitating majority rule, § 2:32
- Free speech as safety valve for stability, § 2:35
- Participation function, § 2:33
- Pursuit of enlightened public policy, § 2:34

**PACIFICA DECISION**

- And related issue of sheltering children from offensive speech, § 5:9
- Obscenity and indecency: content regulation of broadcast, § 26:19
- Indecent but not obscene, § 26:20
- Influence on children rationale, § 26:23
- Pacifica and reduced protection for broadcasting, § 26:21
- Pervasiveness rationale, § 26:22
- Obscenity and indecency: content regulation of broadcast and limits on, in Sable ruling, § 26:24
- Developments since Sable, § 26:25

**PANDERING OR SOLICITING**

- Application of current obscenity standards: child pornography, § 14:52.70

**PARADES**

- As forums, § 8:33

**PARIS ADULT THEATRE I DECISION**

- Application of current obscenity standards to and significance of, § 14:39

**PARKS**

- As forums, §§ 8:18, 8:18.20, 8:18.30, 8:18.50
- Newsgathering (First Amendment protection), removal of public interest group's surveillance cameras from public parkland, § 25:16.50

## INDEX

### PARODY AND FAIR USE

Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment: free speech safety valve in, § 21:12

### PARTICIPANTS

Gag orders on, in litigation, see **Prior Restraint**

### PARTICIPATION FUNCTION

Free speech contribution to democratic, § 2:33

### PARTIES

Regulation of, see **Elections**

### PATENTLY OFFENSIVE MATERIAL

Obscenity and, see **Miller test**

### PATRONAGE CASES

Political speech and government employees and, see **Government Employees**

### PEDESTRIAN MALLS

As forums, § 8:18.20  
Fairgrounds, § 8:18.30

### PENALTY-ENHANCEMENT STATUTE

Summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to hate speech: Mitchell decision, § 12:26

### PENTAGON PAPERS LITIGATION

Decision in, contemporary history of prior restraint, § 15:5

Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press: prior restraints and, § 25:40

National security and, § 15:13

Absolutist opinions of Justices Black and Douglas, § 15:17

Dissenting opinions, § 15:20

Factual background, § 15:14

Justice Brennan's presumptive invalidity approach, § 15:18

Opinions of Justices White, Stewart, and Marshall: significance of congressional authorization

### PENTAGON PAPERS LITIGATION

—Cont'd

National security and, § 15:13

—Cont'd

of prior restraints, § 15:19

Separate opinions, § 15:16

Supreme Court's per curiam holding, § 15:15

### PERFECT 10, INC. DECISION

Intellectual property and Internet, § 21:14

### PERSONAL GRIEVANCES

Disciplining government employees for speech activity, speech not of public concern, § 18:15

### PERSONALITY

Link between expression and, § 2:22

Classic libertarianism and harm principle, § 2:24

Distinguishing free expression from other forms of self-gratification, § 2:23

Expression and thought, § 2:25

### PERSONAL LOYALTY

Disciplining government employees for speech activity, when speech is disruptive (applying balancing test), § 18:19

### PERVASIVENESS RATIONALE

Obscenity and indecency: content regulation of broadcast in Pacifica decision, § 26:22

### PETITION

Government employees, § 18:24

Political process

Disclosures of petition signatures, § 16:38.50

Restrictions on petition circulators, § 16:38

Reinforcing power of right of, § 16:3

### PHARMACEUTICAL ADVERTISING

Commercial speech in context of professional services

Off-label drug promotion and marketing, § 20:32.60

**PHARMACEUTICAL**

**ADVERTISING—Cont'd**

Commercial speech in context of professional services—Cont'd  
Thompson v. Western States,  
§ 20:32.50

**PHILOSOPHICAL PARADOX**

Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment: policy and, § 21:2

**PHYSICAL HARM**

Heightened scrutiny and, § 4:16

**PHYSICAL OBSTRUCTION**

In abortion protest, see Abortion protest

**PICKERING DECISION**

Disciplining government employees for speech activity: Pickering, Connick, and Waters cases, §§ 18:6, 18:20.60

Evolution of public concern/disruption test: Pickering and Connick, § 18:7

**PICKETING**

Limits on picketing at cemeteries and funerals, § 5:11.50

Privacy in the home and unwanted speech near the home, § 5:11

Restraints directed to picketing, marching or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:53

Limits on picketing and public demonstrations, § 15:54

Picketing of abortion clinics: Madsen decision, § 15:55

**PICO DECISION**

School libraries, § 17:6

**PLACES**

Applicable standard to content-neutral regulation of public forum, see **Time, Place or Manner Standard**

Historically dedicated to free expression, § 8:4

**PLANNED PARENTHOOD LITIGATION**

Threats in context of political rhetoric, § 13:41.50

**PLAYBOY ENTERTAINMENT GROUP DECISION**

Content-based regulation of cable television, § 27:14

**POLICE ACTIVITY**

Public forum doctrines, § 8:53

**POLICY**

Disciplining government employees for speech activity

Defining speech public concern: speech critical of office policy implicating questions of public accountability, § 18:12

When speech is disruptive (applying balancing test), § 18:20

Government as financier and, see **Financier**

Issues of, application of commercial speech doctrines and corporate speech on, § 20:17

Policy paradox: tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment and philosophical and, § 21:2

**POLITICAL ACTIVITY**

See also **Elections**; and entries beginning with term: **Political**

Banning, of some government employees, § 18:4

**POLITICAL AFFILIATION**

Judicial officers, § 16:7.20

**POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS**

Advertising disclosure laws, § 16:39

Candidate's right to spend own money, "Millionaires Amendment" decision, § 16:21

Content regulation of broadcasts of, § 26:11

Equal opportunities for access, § 26:13

Equal opportunities for access: absolute protection against

## INDEX

### **POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS—Cont'd**

- Content regulation of broadcasts of,  
§ **26:11**—Cont'd
  - defamation liability, § **26:14**
- Reasonable access: CBS, Inc. v.  
FCC decision, § **26:12**
- Loans from candidates to campaigns,  
§ **16:21.30**
- Voluntary political contributions of  
government employees, restric-  
tions on, § **16:22**

### **POLITICAL ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE**

- Philosophical issues posed in govern-  
ment as speaker, § **19:3**
- Supreme Court rejection of notion  
of political establishment  
clause, § **19:4**

### **POLITICAL FINANCING**

- Generally, § **16:8**
- Buckley applied to state regulations:  
Nixon v. Shrink Missouri deci-  
sion, § **16:14.30**
- Lower courts, § **16:14.50**
- McConnell v. Federal Election  
Com'n, § **16:14.40**
- Colorado II decision, "coordinated  
expenditures," § **16:14.10**
- Colorado Republican Committee  
decision, § **16:14**
- Corporate election expenditures:  
Citizens United v. Federal Elec-  
tion Com'n
  - Generally, § **16:17**
- Disclaimer and disclosure provi-  
sions for corporate political  
expenditures, § **16:19**
- Political expenditures right of  
corporation, § **16:18**
- Press Clause, §§ **16:17, 22:15**
- Corporate political expenditures in  
Citizens United v. Federal Elec-  
tion Com'n decision
  - Generally, § **16:17**
  - Press Clause, § **22:15**
- Corporate political speech
  - Generally, §§ **16:14, 16:15**

### **POLITICAL FINANCING—Cont'd**

- Corporate political speech—Cont'd
  - Belotti and MCFL decisions:  
corporate political speech  
protected, § **16:16**
- Government employees
  - Contractors, bans on contributions  
by, § **16:20.10**
  - Forced political contributions,  
§ **18:5.50**
- Individual contributions and  
expenditures
  - Generally, § **16:9**
  - Buckley v. Valeo decision, § **16:10**
  - Candidate's right to spend own  
money, "Millionaires amend-  
ment" decision, § **16:21**
  - Comparison, contribution vs.  
expenditure
    - generally, § **16:11**
    - analysis of distinction, § **16:13**
    - distinction drawn by court,  
§ **16:12**
  - Contribution limits struck down by  
court in McCutcheon v. FEC ,  
§ **16:14.80**
  - Vermont's contribution limits  
struck down by court in  
Randall v. Sorrell, § **16:14.60**
- Labor union's contributions and  
expenditures: Citizens United v.  
Federal Election Com'n deci-  
sion, § **16:19**
- Leveling the playing field: Arizona  
Free Enterprise Club's Freedom  
Club Pac v. Bennett decision,  
§ **16:21.50**
- Loans from candidates to campaigns,  
§ **16:21.30**
- McConnell v. Federal Election  
Com'n, § **16:14.40**
- "Millionaires amendment" decision,  
candidate's right to spend own  
money, § **16:21**
- Nonprofit advocacy groups: Federal  
Election Commission v.  
Beaumont, § **16:20**
- Regulation of, § **16:8**
- Restricting contributions, candidates  
who accept public funds,  
§ **16:21.60**

**POLITICAL FINANCING—Cont’d**

Vermont’s contribution limits struck down by court in *Randall v. Sorrell*, § 16:14.60

**POLITICAL LITERATURE**

Disclosures of petition signatures, § 16:38.50  
Distribution of anonymous, § 16:37  
Restrictions on petition circulators, § 16:38

**POLITICALLY INCORRECT POSITIONS**

Academic freedom and taking, see **Education**

**POLITICAL PATRONAGE CASES**

Government employees, § 18:2

**POLITICAL PROCESS**

Campaign advertising disclosure laws, § 16:39  
Candidates  
Incumbents: “resign to run” laws, § 16:35  
**Judicial Candidates** (this index)  
Lessons of *Brown v. Hartlage*, § 16:32  
Libel laws and political campaigns, § 16:34  
Replacements for vacant seats, § 16:36  
Civil rights enforcement, intersection of equality and free speech, § 13:43  
Contributions, lobbyists, § 16:20.20  
Coronavirus pandemic restrictions, § 16:43  
COVID-19 pandemic restrictions, § 16:43  
Crawford decision, challenges to “Voter ID” laws, § 16:40  
Distribution of anonymous political literature, § 16:37  
Elections, regulation, § 16:35.10  
Ethics and recusal restrictions: Nevada Commission on Ethics v. Carrigan, § 16:36.50  
Financing, see **Political Financing**  
Gifts, lobbyists, § 16:20.20

**POLITICAL PROCESS—Cont’d**

Incumbent protection laws, § 16:35.10  
**Judicial Candidates** (this index)  
Judicial officers, political affiliation, § 16:7.20  
Judicial opinions, First Amendment protection for statements in, § 16:32.60  
Limiting foreign influences on elections, § 16:44  
Line warming bans that restrict aid, voters in line, § 16:31.20  
Lobbyists, gifts and contributions, § 16:20.20  
*McConnell v. Federal Election Com’n*, § 16:14.40  
*McCutcheon* decision, § 16:14.80  
Partisan gerrymandering, § 16:42  
Petition circulators, restrictions on, § 16:38  
Petition signatures, disclosure, § 16:38.50  
Political affiliation, judicial officers, § 16:7.20  
Political speech and government employees: discipline cases  
*Heffernan v. City of Paterson, N.J.*, § 16:7.10  
Political speech and government employees: patronage cases, § 16:4  
*Branti v. Finkel*, § 16:6  
*Elrod v. Burns*, § 16:5  
Government funding and patronage decisions, § 16:7.50  
*Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois*, § 16:7  
Political speech and the amendment, § 16:1  
Political speech and core of the amendment, § 16:2  
Reinforcing power of rights of assembly, petition, and association, § 16:3  
Primary elections, regulation, § 16:35.10  
Regulation of elections and political processes, § 16:23  
Blanket primaries, § 16:25.50

## INDEX

### POLITICAL PROCESS—Cont'd

- Regulation of elections and political processes, § 16:23—Cont'd
- Mills v. Alabama, § 16:24
- Regulation of elections and political processes: campaigns, primaries, elections, and parties, § 16:25
- Access to ballots and elections:
  - racial exclusions, § 16:26
- Ballot access restrictions, § 16:27
- Ballot initiatives, § 16:27.50
- False political advertising,
  - § 16:32.30
- Free broadcast air time for candidates, § 16:33
- Independent candidates, § 16:28
- Judicial Candidates** (this index)
- Loyalty oaths, § 16:29
- Nominating conventions,
  - § 16:30.50
- Political parties, § 16:30
- Political parties: nominating conventions, § 16:30.50
- Regulation of speech of candidates. Candidates, above
- Restrictions on activity near polling places: Burson v. Freeman decision, § 16:31
- Term limits pledges, § 16:29.50
- Restrictions on automated political calls and recorded messages,
  - § 16:41
- Restrictions on voluntary political contributions of government employees, § 16:22
- Restrictions on voter apparel, buttons, or insignias, polling places,
  - § 16:31.10
- “Soft Money”
  - Belotti and MCFL decisions: corporate political speech protected, § 16:16
  - Buckley applied to state regulations; Nixon v. Shrink Missouri decision, § 16:14.50
  - Buckley applied to state regulations: Nixon v. Shrink Missouri decision
    - generally, § 16:14.30

### POLITICAL PROCESS—Cont'd

- “Soft Money”—Cont'd
  - Buckley applied to state regulations: Nixon v. Shrink Missouri decision—Cont'd
  - Lower courts, § 16:14.50
  - McConnell v. Federal Election Com’n, § 16:14.40
  - Colorado II decision, “coordinated expenditures,” § 16:14.10
  - Colorado Republican Committee decision, § 16:14
  - McConnell v. Federal Election Com’n, § 16:14.40
  - Regulation of political financing: regulation of corporate political speech, § 16:15
  - Vermont’s contribution limits struck down by court in Randall v. Sorrell, § 16:14.60
  - Volunteer lobbyists, § 16:20.30
  - Voter apparel, buttons, or insignias, restrictions on, polling places,
    - § 16:31.10
  - “Voter ID” law challenges, § 16:40
  - Wisconsin Right to Life decision,
    - § 16:14.70

### POLITICAL SPEECH

- Commercial speech intersection with political speech, regulation,
  - § 20:31.30
- First Amendment not limited to protection of, § 2:40
  - Supreme Court rejection notion of the amendment limited to political speech, § 2:46
- First Amendment not limited to protection of political speech: fallacy of limiting the amendment to political issues, § 2:41
- Importance does not equate exclusivity, § 2:42
- Limiting freedom of speech to politics as form of statism, § 2:45
- Political and nonpolitical inseparable, § 2:44
- Speech making life worth living,
  - § 2:43

**POLLACK DECISION**

- Captive audience on government property, § 5:13
- Reconciling Pollack and Lehman: making sense of captive audience principle, § 5:15

**POLLING PLACES**

- Line warming bans that restrict aid, voters in line, § 16:31.20
- Public forum doctrines, § 8:33.30
- Regulation of elections and restrictions on activity near: Burson v. Freeman decision, § 16:31
- Voter apparel, buttons, or insignias, restrictions on, § 16:31.10

**POP-UPS**

- Internet advertising, § 27:26

**PORNOGRAPHIC SPEECH**

- Obscene and, see **Obscene Speech**

**POSADAS DE PUERTO RICO DECISION**

- Government using speech regulation to discourage casino gambling and, § 20:20
- Repudiation of Posadas: holding in 44 Liquormart, § 20:25

**POWER ABUSE**

- Free speech contribution to checking value and control of, § 2:31

**PRACTICE**

- Importance of free speech theory in, generally, § 2:8

**PRECISION PRINCIPLE**

- As core principle in heightened scrutiny, § 4:23
- Central importance of precision in speech regulation, § 4:24
- Relationship to overbreadth, vagueness, and least restrictive means doctrine, § 4:25
- Vagueness and overbreadth doctrines and, § 6:1

**PREEMPTION**

- Intellectual property, Internet and copyright preemption, § 21:15

**PRESS CLAUSE**

- Antitrust, tax, and labor laws, § 22:21
- Antitrust, § 22:22
- Labor legislation, § 22:24
- Tax laws, § 22:23
- First Amendment ban on discrimination among different media, § 22:19
- Lessons of Turner Broadcasting, § 22:20
- Meaning of, § 22:1
- Meaning of: conundrums posed by the two clauses, § 22:5
- Definitional difficulties, § 22:6
- Mode of communication, § 22:7
- Social function, § 22:9
- Subject matter, § 22:8
- Meaning of: text of First Amendment, § 22:2
- Inviting language, § 22:3
- Uncertain historical evidence, § 22:4
- Special First Amendment protection, § 22:10
- Access to the press cases, § 22:17
- Conclusion, § 22:18
- Corporate election expenditures: Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n, § 22:15
- Defamation clause, § 22:12
- Lack of resolution, § 22:11
- Press access cases, § 22:16
- Prohibition against singling out press for specially disfavorable treatment, § 22:14
- Reporter's privilege cases, § 22:13

**PRESS-ENTERPRISE I AND II DECISION**

- Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: developments after Richmond Newspapers decision, §§ 25:6, 25:7

**PRESUMPTIVE INVALIDITY APPROACH**

- Pentagon Papers litigation and, by Justice Brennan, § 15:18

## INDEX

### PRIMARIES

Regulation of, see **Elections**

### PRIMUS DECISION

Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by attorneys, § 20:29

### PRINT MODEL

Access by the public to institutional press: Miami Herald decision, § 25:47

### PRIOR RESTRAINT

Application of current obscenity standards: prior restraints in obscenity cases, § 14:56

Forfeitures under RICO provisions: the Alexander decision, § 14:61

Freedman v. Maryland requirements, § 14:58

Other procedural safeguards: licensing procedures, § 14:59

Other procedural safeguards: seizures of allegedly obscene material, § 14:60

Prior restraints and nuisance statutes, § 14:62

Requirement of immediate judicial review, § 14:57

Use of informal pressure to censor adult material, § 14:63

Commercial speech cases, in, § 15:62

Defamation, *Tory v. Cochran* Supreme Court decision, § 15:57.50

Door-to-door canvassing, § 15:54.50

Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press: *Pentagon Papers* decision, § 25:40

First Amendment principles governing regulation of hate speech: racist demonstrations and prior restraints: *Skokie* case, § 12:27

*Freedman v. Maryland* requirements, see **Freedman v. Maryland**

History of, § 15:1

Overview of current doctrines, § 15:7

### PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd

History of, § 15:1—Cont'd

Prior restraints, English common law, and First Amendment, § 15:2

History of: contemporary history, § 15:3

*Nebraska Press* decision, § 15:6

*Pentagon papers* decision, § 15:5

Supreme Court decision in *Near v. Minnesota*, § 15:4

Judicial proceedings and, § 15:27

Fair trials and free press, § 15:28

*Nebraska Press* standard, § 15:29

Judicial proceedings and application of *Nebraska Press* standard, § 15:30

Judicial proceedings and application of *Nebraska Press* standard:

*Noriega* tapes litigation, § 15:37

Critique of *Noriega* decision, § 15:39

Facts about the tapes and disputes, § 15:38

Sequels to *Noriega*: restraints on disclosure of attorney/client conversations, § 15:40

Judicial proceedings and application of *Nebraska Press* standard: presumption against gag order, § 15:31

Indirect burdens of press coverage, § 15:34

Influence of concurring opinions, § 15:32

Juvenile proceedings and cases affecting privacy of children, § 15:33

Protecting identity of jurors, § 15:36

Restraints on information about judicial proceedings gathered through independent sources, § 15:35

Judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:41

Attorneys, § 15:45

Attorneys: lower court decisions on attorney gag orders, § 15:47

**PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd**

- Judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:41—Cont'd
- Attorneys: restrictions on books written by attorneys on their cases, § 15:48
- Attorneys: restrictions on discussions of completed proceedings, § 15:47.50
- Contempt sanctions against judges, § 15:50.50
- Cross-reference to general First Amendment principles governing restrictions on dissemination of truthful information, § 15:44
- Distinguishing between gag orders furthering administration of justice and orders protecting image of courts and judges, § 15:43
- Meaning of Gentile: standard for extrajudicial statements by lawyers, § 15:46
- Protective orders prohibiting release of information obtained through discovery, § 15:51
- Restraints involving jurors, § 15:50
- Thinking clearly about distinction between participants and nonparticipants, § 15:42
- Wearing buttons or other symbolic forms of communications in court, § 15:49
- Websites, § 15:45.50
- Judicial rejection of view that First Amendment concerns only, § 1:12
- National security and, § 15:11
- Dicta in *Near v. Minnesota*, § 15:12
- Progressive case, § 15:21
- National security and: other decisions in national security cases, § 15:22
- “National security letters,” non-disclosure requirements, § 15:22.50

**PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd**

- National security and: other decisions in national security cases, § 15:22—Cont'd
- Preclearance procedures for government employees, § 15:24
- Preclearance procedures for government employees: lower court decisions, § 15:26
- Preclearance procedures for government employees: *Snepp* decision, § 15:25
- Restrictions on distribution of material on military bases, § 15:23
- National security and: Pentagon papers, § 15:13
- Absolutist opinions of Justices Black and Douglas, § 15:17
- Dissenting opinions, § 15:20
- Factual background, § 15:14
- Justice Brennan’s presumptive invalidity approach, § 15:18
- Opinions of Justices White, Stewart, and Marshall: significance of congressional authorization of prior restraints, § 15:19
- Separate opinions, § 15:16
- Supreme Court’s *per curiam* holding, § 15:15
- “National security letters,” non-disclosure requirements, § 15:22.50
- Other applications of, § 15:56
- Defamation, § 15:57
- Expression, enforcing contracts restricting, § 15:59.50
- Other intellectual property applications, § 15:61
- Privacy
- Generally, § 15:58
- Domestic relations, § 15:58.70
- Employee privacy, protecting, § 15:58.50
- Procter & Gamble/Bankers Trust/Business Week* case, § 15:52
- Restraints designed to protect commercial or economic interests, § 15:59

## INDEX

### **PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd**

- Other applications of, § 15:56
  - Cont'd
  - Restraints in copyright cases, § 15:60
  - Sex offenders, restraints on, §§ 15:61.50, 15:61.60
  - Tory v. Cochran Supreme Court decision, § 15:57.50
- Procedural issues concerning prior restraints
  - Generally, § 15:63
  - Freedman v. Maryland requirements, see **Freedman v. Maryland**
  - Long waiting periods, § 15:71.60
  - Procedure requirements, § 15:64
- Procedural issues concerning prior restraints: contempt of court and collateral bar rule, § 15:72
- Lessons of Walker and Shuttlesworth decisions, § 15:73
- Long waiting periods, § 15:71.60
- Transparently invalid exception, § 15:74
- Transparently invalid exception: Providence Journal decision, § 15:76
- Transparently invalid exception: statement in Walker, § 15:75
- Public property trespass, § 15:54.70
- Rape victims, protecting the privacy of, § 15:33.50
- Rationales underlying, § 15:8
  - Distinguishing between prior restraints and subsequent punishment, § 15:9
  - Special censorship power of prior restraints, § 15:10
- Restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:53
- Door-to-door canvassing, § 15:54.50
- Limits on picketing and public demonstrations, § 15:54
- Picketing of abortion clinics: Madsen decision, § 15:55
- Small gatherings, § 15:54.10

### **PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd**

- Restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:53
  - Cont'd
  - Trespassing on public property, § 15:54.70
- Sex offenders, restraints on, §§ 15:61.50, 15:61.60
- Symbolic speech, Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:33
- Tory v. Cochran Supreme Court decision, § 15:57.50
- Trespassing on public property, § 15:54.70
- Websites
  - Judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:45.50

### **PRISONS AND PRISONERS**

- “Captive audience,” prison regulations, § 5:16
- Obscene (and pornographic) speech, restricting sexual materials in prisons, § 14:42.50
- Press access outside judicial proceedings, prison visitation cases, § 25:14

### **PRIVACY (AND RELATED TORTS)**

- Autopsy photographs, § 24:6.50
- Driver's Privacy Protection Act, § 24:20
- Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press: public records and, § 25:43
- Faulty instructions, § 24:15
- First Amendment and
  - Generally, § 24:1
  - Appropriation (the right of publicity), § 24:4
  - False light invasion of privacy, § 24:3
  - Identity theft laws, § 24:19
  - Introduction, § 24:2
  - Intrusion, § 24:6
  - Publication of private facts, § 24:5

**PRIVACY (AND RELATED TORTS)**

**—Cont'd**

- Gun-for-hire ads: Soldier of Fortune cases, § 24:16
- Home, see Captive audience; Stanley v. Georgia
- Identity theft laws and First Amendment, § 24:19
- Imitative behavior, beyond: Weirum v. RKO, § 24:14
- Infliction of emotional distress
  - Generally, § 24:7
  - Hustler background, § 24:10
  - Hustler opinion, § 24:11
  - Hustler v. Falwell litigation, § 24:9
  - Overview of the tort, § 24:8
- Intellectual property and First Amendment policy, tensions between, § 21:4.50
- Liability for harm caused by imitative or copycat behavior
  - Generally, § 24:13
  - Beyond imitative behavior: Weirum v. RKO, § 24:14
- Manuals providing detailed instructions on how to commit criminal acts, § 24:17
- Nebraska Press standard presumption against gag order and cases affecting privacy of children, § 15:33
- Prior restraint applied in, § 15:58
- Threats of violence, civil liability for, § 24:18
- Tort claims based on physical harms caused by publications and broadcasts, § 24:12

**PRIVATE CLUBS**

- Publications and theatrical presentations, § 17:14
- Public forum doctrines, § 8:23

**PRIVATE FIGURES/PUBLIC FIGURES**

- Defamation and, § 23:4

**PRIVATE POSSESSION OF OBSCENE MATERIAL**

- Application of current obscenity standards to, Stanley V. Georgia
- Facts and holding, § 14:45

**PRIVATE POSSESSION OF OBSCENE MATERIAL**

**—Cont'd**

- Application of current obscenity standards to, Stanley V. Georgia
  - Cont'd
  - Home, privacy of, § 14:46
  - Information, right to receive, below
  - Information, right to receive
    - Generally, § 14:47
    - Limitations on right to receive, § 14:49
    - Recognition of right to receive, § 14:48

**PRIVILEGE**

- Academic freedom and claims of academic researcher's privilege, § 17:38.60
- Distinction between right and, see **Right/Privilege Distinction**

**PROFANITY**

- Disciplining government employees for speech activity, speech not of public concern, § 18:14

**PROFESSIONALISM CONCEPT**

- Government as librarian, curator, and arts impresario and, § 19:16

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

- See **Commercial Speech**

**PROGRESSIVE DECISION**

- Prior restraint for reasons of national security and, § 15:21

**PROHIBITION**

- Special First Amendment press protection and, against singling out press for specially disfavorable treatment, § 22:14

**PROPAGANDIST**

- Philosophical issues posed in government as, in Meese v. Keene and government as propagandist
  - Generally, § 19:5
  - Critical view of the case, § 19:7
  - Holding in the case, § 19:6

## INDEX

### PROPORTIONALITY PRINCIPLE

Government as financier and, see  
**Financier**

### PROSECUTIONS

Development of, for obscenity  
Generally, § 14:3  
Hicklin test, § 14:4  
Use of Hicklin to censor serious  
literature, § 14:5

### PROSTITUTION

Closure of adult establishments used  
for solicitation of, unrelated to  
content of expression in apply-  
ing current obscenity standards  
against pornography, § 14:55

### PROTECTIVE ORDERS

Prohibiting release of information  
obtained through discovery,  
judicial proceedings and,  
§ 15:51

### PROTESTS

Liability, clear and present danger,  
§ 10:44

### PROVIDENCE JOURNAL DECISION

Transparently invalid exception,  
contempt of court and, § 15:76

### PRURIENT INTEREST STANDARD

Not all sexual speech is obscene:  
Roth and, § 14:9

### PRURIENT INTEREST TEST

Miller, see Miller test

### PUBLIC

Access by the, to institutional press,  
§ 25:46  
Broadcast model: Red Lion deci-  
sion, § 25:47  
Print model: Miami Herald deci-  
sion, § 25:47

### PUBLICATION

First Amendment, privacy and, of  
private facts, § 24:5

### PUBLICATIONS AND THEATRICAL PRESENTATIONS

In education, § 17:8  
Nonschool-sponsored activities,  
§ 17:13  
In education: sponsored by schools  
Activities at high schools and  
elementary schools:  
Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier,  
§ 17:10  
Censorship of school newspaper  
in violation of First  
Amendment, § 17:10.50  
Activities at universities, § 17:9  
Refusals to accept advertising,  
§ 17:12  
Theatrical presentations, § 17:11

### PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Content regulation of, § 26:15  
See also **Broadcast Regulation**

### PUBLIC CONCERN/DISRUPTION TEST

Disciplining government employees  
for speech activity, see **Govern-  
ment Employees**

### PUBLIC CONCERN STANDARD

Defamation and matters of, § 23:5

### PUBLIC DEMONSTRATIONS

Limits on, § 15:54

### PUBLIC FIGURES/PRIVATE FIGURES

Defamation and, § 23:4

### PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINES

Categories of forums, § 8:2  
Commercial speech, limitations on  
commercial vending in public  
forum spaces, § 20:49  
Conference centers, § 8:30.50  
Content-neutral regulation  
Generally, §§ 8:35 to 8:50  
Small gatherings, § 8:48.20  
Time, place, or manner, below  
Convention centers, § 8:30.50  
Courtrooms, § 8:32.50

## **PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINES**

### **—Cont'd**

- Determining whether facility is nonforum, § 8:10
- Extent of use, § 8:12
- Purpose of forum, § 8:11
- Determining whether facility is nonforum: requirement of intent to create designated public forum, § 8:13
- Alternative emphasis: critical mass theory, § 8:15
- Private entities, attempts to limit forums through commercial arrangements with, § 8:15.50
- Supreme Court emphasis on intent, § 8:14
- Eliminating an entire medium of expression: *Ladue v. Gilleo*, § 8:50
- Environmental concerns
  - Generally, § 8:45
  - Controlling traffic flow and congestion, § 8:47
  - Noise regulations, § 8:46
  - Safety and security restrictions on access to public housing complexes, § 8:48.10
- Examples of permissible time, place, or manner regulations
  - Generally, § 8:44
  - Cross-references to public forum law, § 8:44
  - Environmental concerns, above
- Examples of public and nonpublic forums, § 8:16
  - Aerial advertising, § 8:18.10
  - Airspace above beaches, § 8:18.10
  - Conference centers, § 8:30.50
  - Convention centers, § 8:30.50
  - Courthouses, jails, and city halls, § 8:32
  - Courtrooms, § 8:32.50
  - Fairgrounds, § 8:18.30
  - Libraries, § 8:31
  - Military bases, § 8:29
  - Parades, § 8:33

## **PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINES**

### **—Cont'd**

- Examples of public and nonpublic forums, § 8:16—Cont'd
- Parks, §§ 8:18, 8:18.20, 8:18.30, 8:18.50
- Pedestrian malls, § 8:18.20
- Polling places, § 8:33.30
- Public transportation, § 8:26
- Residents, attempts to limit forums to, § 8:18.50
- Shopping centers, § 8:30
- Streets and sidewalks, § 8:17
- Theatres, § 8:27
- University funding: the *Rosenberger* case, §§ 8:25 to 8:33
- Urban plazas, § 8:18.20
- Utilities, § 8:28
- Websites, § 8:33.20
- Examples of public and nonpublic forums: public schools, § 8:19
- Clubs and organizations meeting after school: *Mergens* and *Good News Club* decision, § 8:22
- Discrimination against religious point of view, § 8:24
- Nature of educational facilities, § 8:20
- Private clubs that discriminate in membership, § 8:23
- University classrooms: *Widmar v. Vincent*, § 8:21
- Government speech, §§ 8:1.10, 8:1.50
- License plates, § 8:33.10
- “Limited” public forums, § 8:8.50
- Narrow tailoring of regulation
  - Generally, § 8:39
  - Least restrictive, does not mean, § 8:41
  - Significant interest, § 8:40
- Overview: public forums and the right/privilege distinction, § 8:1
- Physical integrity of public forum, § 8:48
- Police activity, recording, § 8:53
- Polling places, § 8:33.30

## INDEX

### PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINES

#### —Cont'd

- Public office-holders, social media, § 8:33.25
- Recording police activity, § 8:53
- Relevance, § 8:43
- Shutting down a public forum, § 8:51
- Significance of distinction between traditional and designated public forums, § 8:9
- Sign regulation, *Reed v. Gilbert*, § 8:34.50
- Social media, public office-holders, § 8:33.25
- Standard applicable to time, place, or manner
  - Generally, § 8:37
  - Adequate alternative channels must be available, § 8:42
  - Must be content-neutral regulations, § 8:38
  - Regulation must be narrowly tailored to serve significant government interest. Narrow tailoring of regulation, above
  - Small gatherings, § 8:48.20
- Standards, external vs. internal in public forum definition and regulation, § 8:15.60
- Symbolic speech. application of public forum law principles to “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:29
- Takeover of public forums for private events, § 8:34
- Televised political debates: the *Forbes* decision, § 8:52
- Three categories of forums and nonforums
  - Designated public forums, § 8:7
  - Nonforums, § 8:8
  - Traditional public forums, below
- Time, place, or manner of content-neutral regulation
  - Generally, §§ 8:36 to 8:48.10
  - Burden of proof in time, place, and manner cases, § 8:49

### PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINES

#### —Cont'd

- Time, place, or manner of content-neutral regulation—Cont'd
- Examples of permissible time, place, or manner regulations, above
- Standard applicable to time, place, or manner, above
- Traditional public forums
  - Generally, § 8:3
  - Content-based regulation, § 8:5
  - Content-neutral regulation, § 8:6
  - Places historically dedicated to free expression, § 8:4
- University funding: the *Rosenberger* case, §§ 8:25 to 8:33
- Voting places, § 8:33.30
- Websites, § 8:33.20

### PUBLIC FORUM LAW

See **Public Forum Doctrines**

Hate speech on campus and, see **Hate Speech**

### PUBLIC HOUSING

- Public forum doctrines, content-neutral regulation of time, place, or manner: examples of permissible time, place, or manner regulations to control environmental concerns, § 8:48.10

### PUBLIC INDECENCY

- Overview, § 14:2

### PUBLIC INTEREST GROUP

- Newsgathering (First Amendment protection), surveillance cameras placed by public interest groups, § 25:16.50

### PUBLICITY, RIGHT OF

- First Amendment and privacy, § 24:4

### PUBLIC MATCHING FUNDS

- Leveling the playing field: *Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club Pac v. Bennett* decision, § 16:21.50

**PUBLIC MATCHING FUNDS**  
—Cont'd

Restricting contributions, candidates who accept public funds, § 16:21.60

**PUBLIC OFFICIAL**

Defamation, public official defined, § 23:3.75

**PUBLIC POLICY**

Free speech contribution to pursuit of enlightened, § 2:34

**PUBLIC PROPERTY**

Prior restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:54.70

**PUBLIC RECORDS**

Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press: privacy decisions and, § 25:43

**PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

As forums, § 8:19  
Clubs and organizations meeting after school: Mergens and Good News Club decision, § 8:22  
Discrimination against religious point of view, § 8:24  
Nature of educational facilities, § 8:20  
University classrooms: Widmar v. Vincent, § 8:21

**PUBLIC SECTOR UNIONS**

Disciplining government employees for speech activity, defining speech of public concern, § 18:12.50  
Forced speech and union dues, § 4:29  
Heightened scrutiny forms, forced speech, § 4:26.50

**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

As forum, § 8:26

**PUBLIC VULGARITY**

Application of current obscenity standards to: attempts to restrict

**PUBLIC VULGARITY—Cont'd**  
nonobscene nonsexual, § 14:43

**PUBLISHER**

Government as, see **Government**

**PUNISHMENT**

Distinguishing between prior restraints and subsequent, § 15:9

**QUESTIONS OF LAW OR FACT**

Government employees, § 18:26

**QUID PRO QUO HARASSMENT**

Employment discrimination and, § 13:7

**RACIAL EXCLUSIONS**

Regulation of elections and access to ballots, § 16:26

**RACIAL HARASSMENT**

Academic freedom, § 17:38.50

**RACIAL SPEECH**

See also **Hate Speech**  
Governmental use of, and affirmative action, see **Government**

**RACIST DEMONSTRATIONS**

First Amendment principles governing regulation of hate speech: racist demonstrations and prior restraints: Skokie case, § 12:27

**RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT (RICO)**

Prior restraints in obscenity cases: application of current obscenity standards, forfeitures under RICO provisions in the Alexander decision, § 14:61

**RAILWAY EXPRESS AGENCY v. NEW YORK**

Evolution of commercial speech doctrine in, § 20:3

**RANDALL V. SORRELL**

Vermont's political contribution limits struck down by court in, § 16:14.60

## INDEX

### **RANKIN v. MCPHERSON**

Disciplining government employees  
for speech activity, defining  
speech of public concern,  
§ 18:11

### **RAPE VICTIMS**

Prior restraint, protecting the privacy  
of rape victims, § 15:33.50

### **R.A.V. v. CITY OF ST. PAUL**

Applied to abortion protest: no  
protection for use of force, phys-  
ical obstruction, or damage to  
property: applying R.A.V. and  
Mitchell rulings, § 13:36

Campus hate speech and relevance of  
R.A.V., § 17:25

Distinguishing content discrimination  
from viewpoint discrimination:  
court's pronouncements in,  
§ 3:10

First Amendment principles govern-  
ing regulation of

Generally, §§ 12:11, 12:14

Court's content-discrimination  
rationale, § 12:17

Court's invocation of rule against  
viewpoint discrimination,  
§ 12:19

Court's refusal to invoke  
overbreadth doctrine as basis  
for its ruling, § 12:15

Court's refusal to permit viewpoint  
discrimination on theory of its  
justification under strict  
scrutiny test, § 12:21

Court's rejection of categorical  
jurisprudence of Chaplinsky,  
§ 12:16

Facts of the case, § 12:12

Lower court ruling, § 12:13

Regulation of classes of speech for  
reasons relating to proscrib-  
ability of the class, § 12:18

Relationship of emotion principle  
to court's discussion of  
viewpoint discrimination,  
§ 12:20

Secondary effects not to be based on,  
§ 9:22

### **R.A.V. v. CITY OF ST. PAUL**

—Cont'd

Viewpoint, see **Viewpoint  
Discrimination**

Virginia v. Black, cross-burning,  
reinterpretation of R.A.V. case,  
§ 12:21.50

### **REACTIVE HARMS**

Heightened scrutiny and, § 4:18

### **“RECEIVE” INFORMATION, RIGHT TO**

Current free speech doctrine,  
overview, § 2:73

Obscenity, See **Stanley v. Georgia**

### **RECORDINGS**

Public forum doctrines, police activ-  
ity, § 8:53

### **RECREATIONAL DANCING**

Two-step inquiry in application of  
modern symbolic speech  
principles, critical content the-  
ory, § 11:23.50

### **RECUSAL**

Ethical conduct: Nevada Commission  
on Ethics v. Carrigan,  
§ 16:36.50

### **REDEEMING VALUE**

Serious, as prong of Miller test

Generally, §§ 14:33, 14:34

“Obscene” speech not equated  
with “violent” speech,  
§ 14:35.50

Redeeming value must be serious,  
§ 14:35

Redeeming value not determined  
by community standards,  
§ 14:35

### **RED LION DECISION**

Access by the public to institutional  
press: broadcast model, § 25:48

Content regulation developments  
since

Generally, § 26:6

Fairness doctrine and administra-  
tive and political roller

**RED LION DECISION—Cont'd**

- Content regulation developments since—Cont'd
  - coaster after Red Lion, § 26:10
- Content regulation developments since in Democratic National Committee decision, § 26:7
- No general right of access to broadcasters, § 26:9
- State action question, § 26:8
- Content regulation of broadcast, fairness doctrine and related issues, § 26:5

**REDUCED SCRUTINY**

- Based on setting, § 2:72
- Based on subject matter, § 2:69
- Circumstances where content-based speech regulation received, § 2:68
- Strict scrutiny displaced by, § 4:4

**REFUGE**

- Home as, captive audience and, § 5:5

**REGAN v. TAXATION WITH REPRESENTATION**

- Government as speech financier: policy and doctrinal tensions, proportionality principle in, § 19:12

**REGISTRATION**

- Government as speaker: philosophical issues posed, § 19:2.60

**RELATIONSHIP HARMS**

- Heightened scrutiny and, § 4:17

**RELEVANCY PRINCIPLE**

- Disciplining government employees for speech activity, defining speech of public concern, § 18:11

**RELIGIOUS SPEECH AND SYMBOLS**

- Education, § 17:40
- Government employees, see **Government Employees**

**REMEDIES**

- For violation of Federal Access Act, § 13:30

**REPORTER'S PRIVILEGE**

- Newsgathering and, see **Newsgathering**
- Special First Amendment press protection, reporter's privilege cases, § 22:13

**REPUBLICAN PARTY v. WHITE**

- Judicial candidates, limiting speech of, § 16:32.50

**RESEARCH**

- Academic freedom and claims of academic researcher's privilege, § 17:38.60

**RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS**

- Unwanted speech near the home: picketing and other expressions in, § 5:11

**"RESIGN TO RUN" LAWS**

- Regulation of speech of candidates: incumbents and, § 16:35

**RETALIATION CLAIMS**

- Content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, § 3:14

**REVENGE PORN**

- Application of current obscenity standards to, § 14:49.50

**RICHMOND NEWSPAPERS DECISION**

- Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: developments after, § 25:4
- Globe Newspaper Co. v. Superior Court, § 25:5
- Press-Enterprise I, § 25:6
- Press-Enterprise II, § 25:7
- Press access to criminal judicial proceedings and historic, § 25:3

**RICO (RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT)**

- Prior restrains in obscenity cases: application of current obscenity

## INDEX

### **RICO (RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT)**

#### **—Cont'd**

standards, forfeitures under  
RICO provisions in the Alexan-  
der decision, § 14:61

### **“RIDE-ALONGS”**

Newsgathering (First Amendment  
protection), § 25:37.50

### **RIGHT/PRIVILEGE DISTINCTION**

Generally, § 7:1

Distinction between public forums  
and, § 8:1

Government employees and, § 18:1

Philosophical underpinnings of, § 7:2

Notion of right, § 7:3

Oliver Wendell Holmes' influence,  
§ 7:4

Unconstitutional conditions doctrine,  
§ 7:5

Antidote to right/privilege distinc-  
tion, § 7:6

Application of the doctrine, § 7:7

Rough proportionality standard of  
Dolan v. City of Tigard,  
§ 7:14

Summary: pliability of the doc-  
trine, § 7:15

Unconstitutional conditions doctrine:  
special note on unemployment  
compensation cases, § 7:8

Employment Division v. Smith,  
§ 7:13

Frazee v. Illinois Department of  
Employment Security, § 7:12

Hobbie v. Unemployment Appeals  
Commission, § 7:11

Sherbert v. Verner, § 7:9

Thomas v. Review Board, § 7:10

### **RIGHTS OF TRANSGENDER PERSONS**

See **Transgender**

First amendment

Protection, § 13:44

Transition procedures, gender,  
§ 13:44

### **R.J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO COMPANY DECISION**

Commercial speech, § 20:45.70

### **ROTH v. UNITED STATES**

Historical overview of freedom of  
speech and, § 14:6

Justices Douglas and Black dis-  
sent, § 14:11

Link between Roth and  
Chaplinsky, § 14:8

Not all sexual speech is obscene:  
Roth and prurient interest  
standard, § 14:9

Obscenity not protected by First  
Amendment, § 14:7

Roth rejection of Hicklin test,  
§ 14:10

Historical overview of freedom of  
speech and: developments from  
Roth and Miller, § 14:12

Independent appellate review  
principle, § 14:15

Scienter requirement, § 14:13

Supreme Court's per curiam  
period, § 14:16

Supreme Court's per curiam  
period: Ginzburg and pandering  
concept, § 14:17

Supreme Court's per curiam  
period: Memoirs gloss on  
Roth, § 14:16

Supreme Court's per curiam  
period: per curiam parade,  
§ 14:18

### **ROUGH PROPORTIONALITY STANDARD OF DOLAN v. CITY OF TIGARD**

Generally, § 7:14

### **ROYALTIES**

Regulating honoraria and royalties  
from outside speaking and writ-  
ing engagements by government  
employees, § 18:5

### **RUMSFELD v. FAIR DECISION**

Military recruiters in law schools,  
§ 17:1.60

**RUST v. SULLIVAN**

Government as speech financier:  
policy and doctrinal tensions,  
proportional principle, § 19:14

**RUTAN v. REPUBLICAN PARTY  
OF ILLINOIS**

Political speech and government  
employees: patronage cases,  
§ 16:7

**SABLE DECISION**

Implications of, § 5:10  
Obscenity and indecency: content  
regulation of broadcast and  
limits on Pacifica decision,  
§ 26:24  
Developments since Sable, § 26:25

**SAFETY**

Public forum doctrines, content-  
neutral regulation of time, place,  
or manner: examples of permis-  
sible time, place, or manner  
regulations to control  
environmental concerns,  
§ 8:48.10

**SCALES DECISION**

Distinguishing between advocacy and  
action in, § 10:19

**SCHENCK DECISION**

Early opinions of Holmes: “bad ten-  
dency” concept in, § 10:4  
No protection for use of force, threat  
of force, physical obstruction, or  
damage to property: floating vs.  
fixed buffer zones, § 13:38

**SCHOOL LIBRARIES**

Government as educator, § 17:5  
Lower court decision, § 17:7  
Pico decision, § 17:6

**SCHOOL-SPONSORED  
ACTIVITIES**

In schools, see **Education**

**SCIENTER REQUIREMENT**

Roth, § 14:13

**SEARCHES AND SUBPOENAS**

Newsroom, § 25:29  
Search warrants, § 25:30  
Statutory and regulatory restraints,  
§ 25:32  
Subpoenas, § 25:31  
Newsroom: cases involving greater  
First Amendment restraints on,  
§ 25:33  
Material generated by the press,  
§ 25:37  
Pressures on journalistic indepen-  
dence, § 25:34  
Program for the future, § 25:35  
Search warrants and subpoenas,  
§ 25:36

**§ 1983 ACTIONS**

Purposeful discrimination, civil rights  
enforcement, § 3:6.40

**SECONDARY EFFECTS  
DOCTRINE**

Content-neutrality, O’Brien test and,  
§ 9:18  
Genesis of secondary effects doc-  
trine: Renton case, § 9:19  
Content-neutrality, O’Brien test and  
placing limits on the doctrine,  
§ 9:20  
Question of doctrine limited to  
sexually oriented establish-  
ments such as adult theatres,  
arcades, bookstores, or dance  
clubs, § 9:21  
Secondary effects not to be based  
on reaction to message of  
speech, § 9:22

**SECURITIES REGULATION**

Commercial speech in context of  
professional services, § 20:33

**SEIZURES**

Prior restraints in obscenity cases:  
application of current obscenity  
standards, allegedly obscene  
material, § 14:60

**SELF-FULFILLMENT**

Human dignity and, freedom of  
speech as end in itself, § 2:21

## INDEX

### SELF-GOVERNANCE

- Democratic, § 2:26
  - Alexander Meiklejohn's influence, § 2:28
  - And theory of free speech, generally, § 2:6
  - Free speech and democratic process, § 2:27
- Rationale in cases involving free speech, § 2:29
- Theory of, as exclusive rationale, § 2:36

### SELF-GRATIFICATION

- Distinguishing free expression from other forms of, § 2:23

### SEVERABILITY

- Overbreadth and, § 6:11

### SEX DISCRIMINATION

- Application of current obscenity standards in attempts to ban pornography on the theory that it constitutes, § 14:54

### SEX OFFENDERS

- Identification cards, § 4:31
- Prior restraint doctrine, §§ 15:61.50, 15:61.60
- Social media restrictions, § 15:61.60

### SEXUAL HARASSMENT

- Academic freedom, § 17:38.50

### SEXUALLY ORIENTED ESTABLISHMENTS

- Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to, such as adult theatres, arcades, bookstores, or dance clubs, § 9:21

### SHERBERT v. VERNER

- Unconstitutional conditions doctrine: special note on unemployment compensation cases, § 7:9

### SHIELD STATUTES

- Source of reporter's privilege in, § 25:18

### SHOPPING CENTERS

- As forums, § 8:30

### SHUTTLESWORTH DECISION

- Procedural issues concerning prior restraints: contempt of court and collateral bar rule, § 15:73

### SIDEWALKS AND STREETS

- As forums, § 8:17

### SIGNAGE

- Content discrimination, *Reed v. Gilbert*, § 8:34.50
- Public property, symbolic speech, "Occupy Wall Street" and other "Occupy Movement" issues, § 11:32

### SIMON & SCHUSTER DECISION

- Finding content discrimination in absence of intent to censor, § 3:7

### SKOKIE DECISION

- First Amendment principles governing regulation of hate speech: racist demonstrations and prior restraints, § 12:27

### SLEEPING OVERNIGHT IN PARKS AND PLAZAS

- Symbolic speech, "Occupy Wall Street" and other "Occupy Movement" issues, § 11:31

### SLURS

- Flag desecration issue in, § 11:13
- Whether workplace slurs qualify as speech on matters of public concern, § 13:12

### SMOKING

- Government regulation of, see *Vices*
- Two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles, critical content theory, § 11:23.60

### SNEPP DECISION

- Preclearance procedures for government employees in national security cases, § 15:25

### SOCIAL FUNCTION

- Conundrums posed by press clause and First Amendment, § 22:9

**SOCIAL ISSUES**

Application of commercial speech doctrines and corporate speech on, § 20:17

**SOCIAL MEDIA**

Content decision regulation, § 8:33.21  
Government employees, § 18:21.50  
Public office-holders, § 8:33.25  
Sex offenders, restrictions on, § 15:61.60

**SOCIAL STABILITY**

Free speech contribution to, § 2:35

**SOFTWARE**

Internet filtering software, § 27:22.75

**SOLICITATION**

Closure of adult establishments used for solicitation of prostitution or other illegal activity unrelated to content of expression, in applying current obscenity standards against pornography, § 14:55

**SONS OF CONFEDERATE  
VETERANS LICENSE PLATE  
CASE**

Government as speaker: philosophical issues posed, case study defining government speech, § 19:2.50

**SPEAKER**

Government as, § 19:1  
Philosophical issues posed in government as, § 19:2  
Political establishment clause, § 19:3  
Supreme Court rejection of notion of political establishment clause, § 19:4  
Philosophical issues posed in government as, in Meese v. Keene and government as propagandist, § 19:5  
Critical view of the case, § 19:7  
Holding in the case, § 19:6

**SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS**

Regulating honoraria and royalties from outside speaking and writing engagements by government employees, § 18:5

**SPECIALTY ADVERTISING**

Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by attorneys through, §§ 20:31, 20:31.30

**SPENCE v. WASHINGTON**

Flag desecration issue in, § 11:14

**STANLEY v. GEORGIA**

Application of current obscenity standards in  
And privacy of the home, § 14:46  
And right to receive information generally, § 14:47  
limitations on right to receive, § 14:49  
recognition of right to receive, § 14:48  
Facts and holding of, § 14:45

**STATE ACTION QUESTIONS**

Content regulation of broadcasts since Red Lion in Democratic National Committee decision, § 26:8

**STATE AND LOCAL LAWS**

Understanding the O'Brien test, prong one as constitutional power application to, § 9:9

**STATE INTEREST**

Commercial speech in context of regulation for aesthetic or environmental purposes: aesthetic and environmental concerns as substantial, § 20:39

**STATISM**

Limiting freedom of speech to politics as form of, § 2:45

**STATUTES**

Statutory and regulatory restraints on newsroom searches and subpoenas, § 25:32

## INDEX

### **STATUTES—Cont’d**

Substantially overbroad, absence of core of legitimate applications, § 6:7

Meaning of substantial overbreadth, § 6:6

### **STOLEN VALOR ACT**

Content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, criminalizing mere “lies,” § 3:7.50

### **STREETS AND SIDEWALKS**

As forums, § 8:17

### **STREET v. NEW YORK**

Flag desecration issue in, § 11:12

### **STRICT SCRUTINY**

As form of heightened scrutiny, see **Heightened Scrutiny**

Court’s refusal to permit viewpoint discrimination on theory of its justification under strict scrutiny test, in R.A.V. decision, § 12:21

Underinclusive laws, § 2:67.50

### **STUDENTS’ GROUPS**

Membership eligibility discrimination, § 17:42

### **STUDENT SPEECH**

Generally, § 17:2

Disruptive or vulgar speech: Bethel School District v. Fraser, § 17:4

Nondisruptive symbolic speech: Tinker v. Des Moines, § 17:3

University distinguished from secondary and pre-secondary students, § 17:2.50

### **SUBPOENAS AND SEARCHES**

Newsroom, see **Searches and Subpoenas**

### **SUBSTANTIAL TRUTH**

Defamation and requirement of false statement of fact and notion of, § 23:8

### **SUPPRESSION OF FREE EXPRESSION**

Understanding the O’Brien test: unrelated to, § 9:11

Case study in application of prong three: peculiar problem of

### **SUPPRESSION OF FREE**

#### **EXPRESSION—Cont’d**

Understanding the O’Brien test: unrelated to, § 9:11—Cont’d

nude dancing, § 9:14

Noncommunicative aspects of conduct being regulated, § 9:13

“Unrelated to free expression” not a reference to ultimate goal of law at issue, § 9:12

### **SUPREME COURT**

See specific matter

### **SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS**

Newsgathering (First Amendment protection), public interest group’s surveillance cameras, § 25:16.50

### **SYMBOLIC SPEECH (AND EXPRESSIVE CONDUCT)**

Camping or sleeping overnight in parks and plazas, “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:31

Chalking and affixing signage on public property

“Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:32

First Amendment

“Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues

Protest activities that constitute “speech,” § 11:30

“Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, obtaining preliminary injunctive relief, § 11:28

Flag desecration cases, § 11:9

Flag desecration cases prior to Johnson and Eichman, § 11:10

Halter v. Nebraska, § 11:11

Smith v. Goguen, § 11:13

Spence v. Washington, § 11:14

Street v. New York, § 11:12

Flag desecration in Johnson and Eichman cases, § 11:15

Lessons distilled from the two cases, § 11:18

**SYMBOLIC SPEECH (AND  
EXPRESSIVE CONDUCT)**

**—Cont'd**

- Flag desecration in Johnson and Eichman cases, § 11:15
- Cont'd
- Texas v. Johnson, § 11:16
- United States v. Eichman, § 11:17
- Injunctions, “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:28
- Nondisruptive speech of students, Tinker v. Des Moines, § 17:3
- “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:27
- Camping, sleeping overnight in parks and plazas, and erection of tents and other structures, § 11:31
- Chalking and affixing signage on public property, § 11:32
- First Amendment cases, obtaining preliminary injunctive relief, § 11:28
- Preliminary injunctive relief in First Amendment cases, § 11:28
- Prior restraint doctrines, § 11:33
- Protest activities that constitute “speech,” § 11:30
- Public law forum principles, § 11:29
- Overview of problem of expressive conduct, § 11:1
- Freedom of speech encompasses communication through symbols and actions other than the use of language, § 11:2
- Overview of problem of expressive conduct: symbolic speech problems and content-neutral regulation of speech permitted under O’Brien test, § 11:3
- Content-based regulation of symbolic speech and expressive conduct triggers same heightened scrutiny as other content-based regulation, § 11:8

**SYMBOLIC SPEECH (AND  
EXPRESSIVE CONDUCT)**

**—Cont'd**

- Overview of problem of expressive conduct: symbolic speech problems and content-neutral regulation of speech permitted under O’Brien test, § 11:3
- Cont'd
- Only expressive conduct regulated for reasons “unrelated to expression” qualifies for O’Brien standard, § 11:7
- Overview of problem of expressive conduct: symbolic speech problems and content-neutral regulation of speech permitted under O’Brien test: distinguishing expressive conduct from mere conduct, § 11:4
- Cowgill litigation as case study on notion of “intent to communicate,” § 11:6
- Federal hate crimes legislation, § 11:5.50
- Hate crime decision: Wisconsin v. Mitchell, § 11:5
- Prior restraint doctrines, “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:33
- Protest activities that constitute “speech,” “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:30
- Public law forum principles, “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:29
- Restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:53
- Limits on picketing and public demonstrations, § 15:54
- Picketing of abortion clinics: Madsen decision, § 15:55
- Two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles, § 11:19
- Step one: determining if regulation is content-neutral or content-based, § 11:20

## INDEX

### SYMBOLIC SPEECH (AND EXPRESSIVE CONDUCT)

#### —Cont'd

- Two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles, § 11:19—Cont'd
  - Step two: determining, if regulation is content-based, whether regulation justifiable under content-based standards, § 11:21
- Symbolic speech and view-point neutrality, § 11:26
- Two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles: critical content theory, § 11:22
- Case study in determining content neutrality in context of symbolic speech: antimask legislation, § 11:25
- Hate speech example, § 11:24
- Nude dancing example, § 11:23
- Recreational dancing, § 11:23.50
- Smoking bans and First Amendment, § 11:23.60
- Wearing buttons or other forms of, in court, § 15:49

### SYMBOLISM PRINCIPLE

- See also **Symbolic Speech**
- As core principle in heightened scrutiny, § 4:14

### TAX LAWS

- Press and, §§ 22:21, 22:23

### TELEMARKETING

- Commercial speech in context of regulation for aesthetic or environmental purposes, § 20:40
- Political calls and recorded messages, § 16:41

### TELEVISION

- See **Broadcast Television; Cable Television**

### TENTS

- Symbolic speech, “Occupy Wall Street” and other “Occupy Movement” issues, § 11:31

### TERMINIELLO DECISION

- Applying Brandenburg standard, § 10:40

### TERRORISM

- Clear and present danger, freedom of association and terrorism, § 10:20.50

### TEXAS v. JOHNSON

- Flag desecration issue in, see **Flag desecration cases**

### THEATERS

- Obscene material. See **Obscene (and Pornographic) Speech**

### THEATRES

- Application of current obscenity standards to, § 14:37
- As forums, § 8:27
- Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to sexually oriented adult, § 9:21
- School, see **Publications and Theatrical Presentations**

### THEFT OF IDENTITY

- Privacy and, § 24:19

### THOMAS v. CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

- Prior restraint doctrine, content-neutral permit rules, § 15:71.50

### THOMAS v. REVIEW BOARD

- Unconstitutional conditions doctrine: special note on unemployment compensation cases, § 7:10

### THOMPSON v. WESTERN STATES

- Commercial speech in context of pharmaceutical advertising, § 20:32.50

### THOUGHT

- Link between expression and, § 2:25

### THREATS

- See also more specific entries
- Planned parenthood litigation, threats in context of political rhetoric, § 13:41.50

## THREATS—Cont'd

Privacy (and related torts), civil liability for threats of violence, § 24:18

Violence and Imminent Lawless Action

The Counterman decision

True threats, § 10:22.60

“True threats,” § 10:22.70

“True threats,” § 10:22.50

The Counterman decision, § 10:22.70

## TIME, PLACE OR MANNER STANDARD

Generally, § 8:36

Adequate alternative channels must be available, § 8:42

Applicable to content-neutral regulation of public forum: burden of proof in time, place, and manner cases, § 8:49

Environmental concerns

Generally, § 8:45

Controlling traffic flow and congestion, § 8:47

Noise regulations, § 8:46

Examples of permissible time, place, or manner regulations

Generally, § 8:44

Cross-references to public forum law, § 8:44

Environmental concerns, above

Must be content-neutral regulations, § 8:38

Narrowly tailored to serve significant government interest

Generally, § 8:39

significant interest, § 8:40

Least restrictive, does not mean, § 8:41

Physical integrity, public forum, § 8:48

## TINKER v. DES MOINES

Nondisruptive symbolic speech of students, § 17:3

## TITLE VII

Hostile environment cases under, see **Employment Discrimination**

## TITLE VII—Cont'd

University of Wisconsin hate speech regulation and asserted parallel to, § 17:24

## TOLERANCE

Conflicts posed by intolerant speech in society committed to, § 12:3

See also **Hate Speech**

## TORTS

**Defamation**

**Privacy (and Related Torts)**

## TRADEMARKS

Government as speaker: philosophical issues posed, § 19:2.60

Offensive or disparaging, § 21:16

## TRADITIONAL PUBLIC FORUMS

See **Public Forum Doctrines**

## TRANSGENDER

See **First amendment**

## TRESPASS

Prior restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:54.70

## TRUTHFUL INFORMATION

Restrictions on reporting of, see **Newsgathering**

Trafficking in, First Amendment bar, *Barntick v. Vopper*, § 25:45.60

## TURNER BROADCASTING DECISION

First Amendment ban on discrimination among different media and lessons of, § 22:20

First Amendment standards for cable television and, § 27:10

## ULTIMATE SEXUAL ACTS

Patently offensive depictions or descriptions of, *Miller test*, § 14:29

## UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS DOCTRINE

Right/privilege distinction and, § 7:5

Antidote to right/privilege distinction, § 7:6

## INDEX

### UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS DOCTRINE

#### —Cont'd

Right/privilege distinction and, § 7:5  
—Cont'd

Application of the doctrine, § 7:7

Rough proportionality standards of  
Dolan v. City of Tigard,  
§ 7:14

Summary: pliability of the doc-  
trine, § 7:15

Right/privilege distinction and:  
special note on unemployment  
compensation cases, § 7:8

Employment Division v. Smith,  
§ 7:13

Frazee v. Illinois Department of  
Employment Security, § 7:12

Hobbie v. Unemployment Appeals  
Commission, § 7:11

Sherbert v. Verner, § 7:9

Thomas v. Review Board, § 7:10

### UNDERINCLUSIVENESS

Strict scrutiny, § 2:67.50

### UNEMPLOYMENT

#### COMPENSATION CASES

Right/privilege distinction and, see  
**Unconstitutional Conditions  
Doctrine**

### UNITED FOODS DECISION

Generic advertising outside of  
regulated industries, § 20:45.50

Heightened scrutiny forms, absence  
of heavy commercial regula-  
tion—forced speech in absence  
of, § 4:27.50

### UNITED STATES v. ALVAREZ

Content-neutral regulation vs.  
content-based regulation,  
criminalizing mere “lies,”  
§ 3:7.50

### UNITED STATES v. EICHMAN

Flag desecration issue in, see **Flag  
Desecration Cases**

### UNITED STATES v. O'BRIEN STANDARD

Content-neutrality and secondary  
effects doctrine, § 9:18

Genesis of secondary effects doc-

### UNITED STATES v. O'BRIEN STANDARD—Cont'd

Content-neutrality and secondary  
effects doctrine, § 9:18—Cont'd  
trine: Renton case, § 9:19

Content-neutrality and secondary  
effects doctrine: placing limits  
on the doctrine, § 9:20

Question of doctrine limited to  
sexually oriented establish-  
ments such as adult theatres,  
arcades, bookstores, or dance  
clubs, § 9:21

Secondary effects not to be based  
on reaction to message of  
speech, § 9:22

Facts and holding in the case, § 9:2

Factual background, § 9:3

Question of Supreme Court's cor-  
rect application of its own  
test, § 9:5

Supreme Court's holding, § 9:4

Importance of, § 9:1

Symbolic speech problems and  
content-neutral regulation of  
speech permitted under, § 11:3

Content-based regulation of  
symbolic speech and expres-  
sive conduct triggers same  
heightened scrutiny as other  
content-based regulation,  
§ 11:8

Only expressive conduct regulated  
for reasons “unrelated to  
expression” qualifies for the  
O'Brien standard, § 11:7

Symbolic speech problems and  
content-neutral regulation of  
speech permitted under the test:  
distinguishing expressive  
conduct from mere conduct,  
§ 11:4

Cowgill litigation as case study on  
notion of “intent to com-  
municate,” § 11:6

Federal hate crime legislation,  
§ 11:5.50

Hate crime decision: Wisconsin v.  
Mitchell, § 11:5

Understanding the test, § 9:6

Prong two: important or substantial

**UNITED STATES v. O'BRIEN  
STANDARD—Cont'd**

Understanding the test, § 9:6

—Cont'd

government interest, § 9:10

Understanding the test, prong four:  
restriction must be “no greater  
than is essential,” § 9:15

Interpretation of prong four: inter-  
mediate scrutiny requirement  
of substantial relationship,  
§ 9:17

Prong four does not incorporate  
least restrictive means test,  
§ 9:16

Understanding the test, prong one:  
constitutional power, § 9:7

Application to state and local laws,  
§ 9:9

Prong one is superfluous, § 9:8

Understanding the test, prong three:  
unrelated to suppression of free  
expression, § 9:11

Case study in application of prong  
three: peculiar problem of  
nude dancing, § 9:14

Noncommunicative aspects of  
conduct being regulated,  
§ 9:13

“Unrelated to free expression” not  
a reference to ultimate goal of  
law at issue, § 9:12

**UNITED STATES v. THOMAS**

Obscenity and online computer  
networks, §§ 14:64, 14:65

**UNIVERSITIES**

Activities at, see **Education**

Classrooms of, as forums: *Widmar v.*  
*Vincent*, § 8:21

**UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
v. EEOC DICTUM**

Reporter's privilege: developments  
since *Branzburg*, § 25:25

**URBAN PLAZAS**

As forums, § 8:18.20

Fairgrounds, § 8:18.30

**U.S. v. WILLIAMS**

Application of current obscenity stan-  
dards: child pornography,  
§ 14:52.70

**UTILITIES**

As forums, § 8:28

**VAGUENESS AND**

**OVERBREADTH DOCTRINES**

Freedom of Access Act and issue of,  
§§ 13:39 to 13:41

8220Informal8221 government pres-  
sure, litigating First Amendment  
claim, § 6:18

Precision principle, § 6:1

Precision principle in heightened  
scrutiny and relationship to  
vagueness, § 4:25

Related and standardless delegation  
of administrative discretion,  
§ 6:2

Application of vagueness doctrine,  
§ 6:15

Commercial speech exception,  
§ 6:12

General operation of overbreadth  
doctrine, § 6:4

Meaning of substantial  
overbreadth, § 6:6

Narrowing construction and fair  
warning requirement, § 6:10

Narrowing construction technique,  
§ 6:9

Overbreadth, §§ 6:3 to 6:12

Overbreadth and severability,  
§ 6:11

Rationales supporting vagueness  
doctrine, § 6:14

Saving overbroad laws through  
narrowing constructions of  
the law, §§ 6:8 to 6:10

Standardless delegation or  
impermissibly broad grants of  
administrative discretion,  
§ 6:16

Substantially overbroad statutes:  
absence of core of legitimate  
applications, § 6:7

Substantial requirement of  
overbreadth, §§ 6:5 to 6:7

## INDEX

### VAGUENESS AND OVERBREADTH DOCTRINES —Cont'd

Related and standardless delegation  
of administrative discretion,  
§ 6:2—Cont'd  
Vagueness, §§ 6:13 to 6:15

### VALENTINE v. CHRESTENSEN

Ill-considered commercial speech  
exception in, § 20:2

### VENDING

Commercial speech, limitations on  
commercial vending in public  
forum spaces, § 20:49

### VICES

Government using speech regulation  
to discourage drinking, smoking,  
gambling, and other, § 20:19  
Broadcasting of casino advertising,  
§ 20:22  
Casino gambling: Posadas de  
Puerto Rico decision, § 20:20  
Interstate advertising of lotteries,  
§ 20:21  
Restrictions on outdoor alcohol  
and tobacco ads, § 20:24  
Tobacco and liquor, § 20:23

### VIEWPOINT DISCRIMINATION

Content neutral and content based,  
see **Content-Neutral Regula-  
tion vs. Content-Based  
Regulation**  
Education, § 17:15  
R.A.V. decision  
Court's invocation of rule against,  
§ 12:19  
Court's refusal to permit viewpoint  
discrimination on theory of its  
justification under strict  
scrutiny test, § 12:21  
Relationship of emotion principle  
to court's discussion of,  
§ 12:20

### VIEWPOINT NEUTRALITY

Of all laws, § 4:8  
Symbolic speech and, § 11:26

### VIEWPOINT REGULATION

See also entries beginning with term:

#### Content

Abortion protest: no protection for  
use of force, threat of force,  
physical obstruction, or damage  
to property: illegal conduct  
regulation vs. content or,  
§ 13:35

### VIGILANTE CONDUCT

Civil rights enforcement and, § 13:23

### VIOLENCE

And imminent lawless action: clear  
and present danger of, see **Clear  
and Present Danger Test**  
Civil rights enforcement and, § 13:23  
“Obscene” speech not equated with  
“violent” speech, redeeming  
value requirement of Miller test,  
§ 14:35.50

### VIRGINIA v. BLACK

Viewpoint discrimination. See **Cross-  
Burning**

### VOLUNTARY ACTIONS

Restrictions on voluntary political  
contributions of government  
employees, § 16:22

### VOLUNTEER LOBBYISTS

Regulation, § 16:20.30

### VOTES AND VOTING

Disclosure of marked voter ballots,  
§ 16:31.50  
Line warming bans that restrict aid,  
voters in line, § 16:31.20  
Sites  
Public forum doctrines, § 8:33.30  
Regulation of elections and restric-  
tions on activity near: Burson  
v. Freeman decision, § 16:31  
Voter apparel, buttons, or insignias,  
restrictions on, polling places,  
§ 16:31.10

### VULGARITY

Application of current obscenity stan-  
dards to: attempts to restrict

**VULGARITY—Cont'd**

nonobscene nonsexual public,  
§ 14:43

Discipline and disciplining

Government employees for speech  
activity, speech not of public  
concern, § 18:14

Student for school-related off-  
campus Internet posting,  
§ 17:4.70

Student verbal, Bethel School District  
v. Fraser, § 17:4

**WALKER DECISION**

Procedural issues concerning prior  
restraints: contempt of court and  
collateral bar rule, § 15:73

Transparently invalid exception state-  
ment, § 15:75

**WARRANTS**

Newsroom search, § 25:30

Search, cases involving greater First  
Amendment restraints on  
newsroom searches and  
subpoenas, § 25:36

**WATERS v. CHURCHILL**

Disciplining government employees  
for speech activity: Pickering,  
Connick, and Waters cases,  
§§ 18:6, 18:7, 18:20.60

Waters court refines framework in,  
§ 18:8

**WATTS DECISION**

Intent and imminence standard in  
Brandenburg and, § 10:22

**WEBSITES**

Abortion protest and the  
Anticybersquatting Consumer  
Protection Act, § 21:12.50

Content decision regulation,  
§ 8:33.21

Prior restraint

Judicial proceedings and gag  
orders on participants in liti-  
gation, § 15:45.50

Public forum doctrines, §§ 8:33.20,  
8:33.25

**WHITNEY DECISION**

Brandeis opinion in, repudiation of  
bad tendency concept and,  
§ 10:13

**WIDMAR v. VINCENT**

University classrooms as forums,  
§ 8:21

**WILLIAMS-YULEE v. THE  
FLORIDA BAR**

Judicial candidates, bans on contribu-  
tion solicitation, § 16:32.55

**WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF**

Hate speech regulation, litigation.  
See **Education**

**WISCONSIN RIGHT TO LIFE  
DECISION**

Regulation of political financing,  
§ 16:14.70

**WORKPLACE**

Disciplining government employees  
for speech activity, when speech  
is disruptive (applying balancing  
test): restriction on non-English  
language use in the workplace,  
§ 18:21

Employment discrimination in, see  
**Employment Discrimination**

Religious symbols, § 18:20.50

Social media posts, § 18:21.50

**WORLD WAR I**

Free speech doctrine prior to, § 10:2

Squelching dissent during, § 10:3

**WRITING ENGAGEMENTS**

Regulating honoraria and royalties  
from outside speaking and writ-  
ing engagements by government  
employees, § 18:5

**YATES DECISION**

Distinguishing between advocacy and  
action in, § 10:19

**ZENGER'S TRIAL**

Free speech and, § 1:4

Strengths and weaknesses of  
Zenger principle, § 1:6

INDEX

**ZONING LAWS**

Use of, to regulate nonobscene adult  
entertainment, § **14:39**