

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 presenta-
tions, § 17:14
- Public forum doctrines, § 8:23
- Question of secondary effects doc-
trine 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 Com-
mon 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 Amend-
ment): “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, regula-
tion of the speech involving,
below
 - Overbreadth exception, § 20:12
 - Truthful advertising of legal activi-
ties, § 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
 Conversion therapy, regulation of, § 20:32.30
 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

COMMERCIAL SPEECH—Cont'd

Illegal activities or false and misleading activities, regulation of the speech involving
 Generally, § 20:13
 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

CONVERSION THERAPY

Commercial speech
Regulation of, § 20:32.30

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**

INDEX

CRIMINAL PROSECUTION

National security, publishing leaked classified national security information, § 25:45.70

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

DANCE CLUBS—Cont'd

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

DANCING

See also **Nude Dancing**

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

DEFAMATION—Cont'd

- On-line defamation and Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, § 23:12
- Prior restraint applied in, § 15:57
- 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

DEMOCRACY—Cont'd

- Free speech contributions to, § 2:30
- Cont'd
- 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

INDEX

DIRECT BROADCAST SATELLITE (DBS)

Cable television, § **27:16**

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 stan-
dards, 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 profes-
sional 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 Amend-
ment 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

EDUCATION—Cont’d

Applications of academic principle
—Cont’d
Controversial or politically incor-
rect positions. Politically
incorrect positions, below
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 discrimina-
tion 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 aca-
demic 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

INDEX

EDUCATION—Cont'd

- First Amendment—Cont'd
 - License and accreditation requirement challenges, § 17:44
 - “Forced speech” doctrine, § 17:1.50
- 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

EDUCATION—Cont'd

- Regulation of clothing, appearance, and other expressive activity, § 17:15—Cont'd
 - Regulation of clothing and related forms of expression, § 17:17
 - Regulation schoolbook publishers, § 17:34.40
 - 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

ELECTIONS—Cont'd

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
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

INDEX

ELECTRONIC MEDIA—Cont'd

- Privacy in the home and: blocking broadcasting and other electronic media entering the home, § 5:8—Cont'd
- Pacifica ruling and related issue of sheltering children from offensive speech, § 5:9

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

EMPLOYMENT

DISCRIMINATION—Cont'd

- Hostile environment cases in
—Cont'd
- 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
- Whether offensive speech principles applicable in marketplace apply to speech in the workplace. Workplace vs. marketplace, below
- Safety valve: protecting speech on matters of public concern, § 13:17
- 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

INDEX

FACILITY—Cont'd

- 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
- 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

FALSE STATEMENT OF FACT —Cont'd

- Requirement of, for defamation, § 23:6—Cont'd
- 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
- 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

FINANCIER—Cont'd

- Government as speech: policy and doctrinal tensions, § 19:9
- Cont'd 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
- 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

FIRST AMENDMENT—Cont'd

- Hate speech governed by regulation principles of, see **Hate Speech**
- History of, see **First Amendment Background**
- “Informal” 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
- 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**
- Press credentials, § 25:49
- 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**

INDEX

FIRST AMENDMENT—Cont'd

- Rights of transgender persons
 - Protection, § 13:44
- State action doctrine, § 2:74
- 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
 - 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
 - Presidential executive orders, § 1:13
- 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

FLAG DESECRATION CASES —Cont'd

- 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 doctrine in, § 20:9

FOX (BOARD OF TRUSTEES v. FOX)

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

FRAZEE v. ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

- Unconstitutional conditions doctrine: special note on unemployment

**FRAZEE v. ILLINOIS
DEPARTMENT OF
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
—Cont’d**
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
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 demonstra-
tions, § 5:11.50

GAMBLING
Government regulation of, see **Vices**

**GARCETTI v. CEBALLOS
DECISION**
Government employees, speech pur-
suant 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

INDEX

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

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

GOVERNMENT—Cont'd

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 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, Johanns decision, § 4:27.60

Hierarchy of interests of, heightened scrutiny and, § 4:19

Johanns decision, § 4:27.60

Legal Services v. Velazquez, funding of legal services, § 19:25

Monuments in public parks as government speech, § 19:16.50

GOVERNMENT—Cont'd

- 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**
- 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. Pena: 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**

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

—Cont'd

- Defining speech of public concern
- Cont'd
- 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**
- 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**

INDEX

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

—Cont'd

- Disruptive speech (applying balancing test)—Cont'd
 - 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
- 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

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

—Cont'd

- 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 writing 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
 - 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 information 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 property 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

HATE SPEECH—Cont'd

First Amendment principles governing regulation of—Cont'd

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

University of Wisconsin litigation. See **Education**

HAZLEWOOD v. KUHLMIEIER

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**

INDEX

HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY

—Cont'd

- 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
- 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

HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY FORMS

—Cont'd

- Core principles: neutrality principle, § 4:6—Cont'd
 - 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
 - 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

HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY

METHODOLOGY—Cont'd

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 Amend-
ment Background**
Group libel and *Beauharnais* deci-
sion, 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**

HISTORY—Cont'd

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 stan-
dards and, see *Stanley v. Geor-
gia*

HONORARIA

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

HOSTILE AUDIENCES

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

HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT CASES

Education, schools, § 17:17.50
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 profes-
sional services, § 20:36

INDEX

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

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

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

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

—Cont'd

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

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

INDEX

INTENT AND IMMINENCE

STANDARD—Cont'd

- 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

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

INTERNET—Cont'd

- 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

JOHANN'S 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

JUDICIAL CANDIDATES—Cont'd

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 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), Barnticki v. Vopper, § 25:45.60

INDEX

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
- 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

LIBEL—Cont'd

- 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 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
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
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**

INDEX

MEDIA—Cont'd

- 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

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

MILLER TEST—Cont'd

- Second prong: patently offensive material, § 14:24—Cont'd
- 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 Proceedings**
- Restricting exposure to, miller for minors concept, § 14:53
- Sending sexually explicit messages, § 14:52.80

MINORS—Cont'd

- 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 misleading from potentially misleading advertising, § 20:15

MITCHELL DECISION

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

INDEX

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

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

NATIONAL SECURITY

Criminal prosecution for publishing leaked classified national security 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**

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**

NEBRASKA PRESS STANDARD —Cont’d

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**

**NEWSGATHERING (FIRST
AMENDMENT PROTECTION)**

—Cont'd

- 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 indepen-
dence, § 25:34
- Program for the future, § 25:35
- Search warrants and subpoenas,
§ 25:36
- Press access outside judicial proceed-
ings, § 25:13
- Access to military campaigns,
§ 25:15
- Burial of military personnel,
§ 25:16
- Prison visitation cases, § 25:14
- 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, institu-
tions, and events, § 25:1
- Arbitration proceedings,
§ 25:12.50

**NEWSGATHERING (FIRST
AMENDMENT PROTECTION)**

—Cont'd

- Press access to information, institu-
tions, and events, § 25:1
- Cont'd
- Civil judicial proceedings, § 25:12
- Press access to juvenile proceed-
ings, § 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
First Amendment, § 25:18
- Reporter's privilege: ambiguous rul-
ing 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.
EOC dictum, § 25:25
- Restrictions on reporting truthful
information, § 25:38
- Restrictions on reporting truthful
information: emerging principle

INDEX

NEWSGATHERING (FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION)

—Cont'd

- 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, *Barnticki 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

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
- 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

**OBSCENE (AND
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH**

—Cont'd

- Adult bookstores, theatres, dance clubs, and similar activities
 - Cont'd
 - 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**
- 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

**OBSCENE (AND
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH**

—Cont'd

- Child pornography—Cont'd
 - 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
- 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

**OBSCENE (AND
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH
—Cont'd**

- Historical overview of freedom of speech and: Supreme Court decision in *Roth v. United States*, § 14:6—Cont'd 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
- Miller for minors concept
 - Restricting exposure to minors, § 14:53
- 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
 - 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

**OBSCENE (AND
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH
—Cont'd**

- 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 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
- Test established in *Miller v. California*: third prong: serious redeeming value, § 14:33
 - Redeeming value must be serious, § 14:34

**OBSCENE (AND
PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH
—Cont'd**

Test established in *Miller v. California*: third prong: serious redeeming value, § 14:33—Cont'd
 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
 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

**OFFENSIVE SPEECH—Cont'd
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

OHRAIK DECISION

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

ONLINE COMMUNICATION

Generally, § 27:18
 Anonymous speech online, § 27:19.50
 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

INDEX

OPINION

- Defamation and protection of (or “nonfact”), § 23:9
- Supreme Court’s holding in *Milkovich v. Lorain Journal*, § 23:11
- Traditional fact/opinion distinction, § 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

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 distinction, § 2:52
- Ad hoc balancing methodology, § 2:55
- Seductive appeal of ad hoc balancing, § 2:57

OVERVIEW—Cont’d

- Ad hoc balancing methodology, § 2:55—Cont’d
- 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 legislative 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 triggering 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 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 process, § 2:27
- Distinguishing theory, method, and doctrine in modern jurisprudence on, § 2:1
- Doctrine of, § 2:13
- Heightened scrutiny methodology, § 2:61
- Defining heightened scrutiny, § 2:62

OVERVIEW—Cont'd

- Heightened scrutiny methodology, § 2:61—Cont'd
 - 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 metaphor, § 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
 - 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 amend-

OVERVIEW—Cont'd

- ment 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
- 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

INDEX

PACIFICA DECISION—Cont'd

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

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

PEDESTRIAN MALLS—Cont'd

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 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

PERSONAL LOYALTY—Cont'd

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

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

PICKETING—Cont'd

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

INDEX

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 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, restrictions on, § 16:22

POLITICAL ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE

- Philosophical issues posed in government 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 decision, § 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

POLITICAL FINANCING—Cont'd

- Corporate election expenditures:
 - Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n
 - Generally, § 16:17
 - Disclaimer and disclosure provisions 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 Election Com'n decision
 - Generally, § 16:17
 - Press Clause, § 22:15
- Corporate political speech
 - Generally, §§ 16:14, 16:15
 - 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 amendment" 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 decision, § 16:19

POLITICAL FINANCING—Cont’d

- 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
- 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

POLITICAL PROCESS—Cont’d

- 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
- 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

INDEX

POLITICAL PROCESS—Cont'd

- Political speech and government employees: patronage cases, § 16:4—Cont'd
 - 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
 - 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

POLITICAL PROCESS—Cont'd

- 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
 - 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

POLITICAL SPEECH—Cont'd

- 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

INDEX

PRESS CLAUSE—Cont'd

- Special First Amendment protection,
§ 22:10—Cont'd
- 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

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 stan-
dards: prior restraints in obscen-
ity cases, § 14:56
- Forfeitures under RICO provi-
sions: the Alexander decision,
§ 14:61
- Freedman v. Maryland require-
ments, § 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

PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd

- Defamation, *Tory v. Cochran*
Supreme Court decision,
§ 15:57.50
- Door-to-door canvassing, § 15:54.50
- Emerging principle of unauthorized
disclosure of truthful informa-
tion by the press: *Pentagon*
Papers decision, § 25:40
- First Amendment principles govern-
ing 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 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

PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd

Judicial proceedings and application of Nebraska Press standard: presumption against gag order, § 15:31—Cont'd

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

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

PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd

Judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, § 15:41—Cont'd

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

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

INDEX

PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd

- National security and: Pentagon papers, § **15:13**—Cont'd
- 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**
- 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**

PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd

- Procedural issues concerning prior restraints: contempt of court and collateral bar rule, § **15:72**—Cont'd
 - 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**
 - 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
- 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

PRIVACY (AND RELATED TORTS)

—Cont'd

- 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
- 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**

INDEX

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 unfavorable 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

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 applying 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 decision, § 25:47

Print model: Miami Herald decision, § 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: *Hazlewood 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 **Government 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
- 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

PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINES

—Cont'd

- Examples of public and nonpublic forums, § 8:16—Cont'd
- 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
- 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

INDEX

PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINES

—Cont'd

Narrow tailoring of regulation

—Cont'd

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

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 regula-
tions, § 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 pub-
lic 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

PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINES

—Cont'd

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

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 permis-
sible 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 inter-
est 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

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 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

INDEX

RANDALL V. SORRELL

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

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

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

—Cont'd

First Amendment principles govern-
ing regulation of—Cont'd

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

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

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 administrative and political roller 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

INDEX

RICO (RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT)

Prior restrains in obscenity cases:
application of current obscenity
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

“Informal” government pressure,
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**