

# 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**

<b>APPELLATE REVIEW PRINCIPLE</b>	<b>ATTORNEYS—Cont'd</b>
Roth and independent, § 14:16	Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by —Cont'd
<b>APPROPRIATION (THE RIGHT OF PUBLICITY)</b>	Regulation of lawyer blogs, § 20:31.30
First Amendment and privacy, § 24:4	Specialty advertising, § 20:31
Prior restraint, §§ 15:58.30, 15:58.70	Thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, § 20:30
<b>ARCADES</b>	Directories that sell advertising, § 20:31.40
Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to sexually oriented, § 9:21	Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press, disciplinary proceedings, § 25:43.50
<b>ARIZONA FREE ENTERPRISE CLUB'S FREEDOM CLUB PAC v. BENNETT</b>	Judicial proceedings and gag orders
Public matching funds to level the playing field, § 16:21.50	Generally, § 15:45
<b>ARTS</b>	Lower court decisions on attorney gag orders, § 15:45
Funding of, by government, see <b>Funding the Arts</b>	Restrictions on books written by attorneys on their cases, § 15:46
Government as librarian, curator, and arts impresario, §§ 19:15 to 19:20, 19:23	Professional directories that sell advertising, § 20:31.40
<b>ASHCROFT v. ACLU</b>	<b>AUTOMATION</b>
Obscene (and pornographic) speech, community standards and internet, § 14:66	Telemarketing restrictions on political calls and recorded messages, § 16:41
<b>ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>AUTOPSY PHOTOGRAPHS</b>
Brandenburg standard and unlawful assembly, § 10:36.60	Privacy (and related torts), § 24:6.50
Reinforcing power of right of, § 16:3	<b>AVERTING EYES</b>
<b>ASSOCIATION</b>	See <b>Captive Audience</b>
Education and problem of forcing inclusion, § 17:41	<b>BAD TENDENCY CONCEPT</b>
Membership eligibility discrimination by student groups, § 17:42	Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of, § 10:7
Reinforcing power of right of, § 16:3	Brandeis opinion in Whitney, § 10:13
<b>ATTORNEYS</b>	Holmes dissent in Abrams v. United States, § 10:8
Bar admission regulations, § 20:27.50	Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of “bad tendency” in Gitlow decision
Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by Generally, § 20:28	Generally, § 10:9
Ohralik and Primus decisions, § 20:29	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

**BEAUVARNAIS 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

**BEAUVARNAIS 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 ruling 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 administrative 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 contributions and expenditures, § 16:10

**BULLYING**  
Education, hostile environment, § 17:17.50

**BURSON v. FREEMAN**  
Regulation of elections and restrictions on activity near polling places, § 16:31

**BUTTERWORTH v. SMITH**  
Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information 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 blocking, § 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 audience 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. Pena: overruling of Metro, § 13:22  
Metro Broadcasting decision, § 13:21  
Heightened scrutiny forms  
The 303 Creative decision, § 4:26.10  
Hostile environments, see **Employment Discrimination**  
Overview, § 13:1  
"Political Process Doctrine," intersection of equality and free speech, § 13:43  
Prior restraints in civil rights enforcement, § 13:42  
Purposeful discrimination, content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, § 3:6.40  
Specific contexts of commercial speech in equality and, § 20:42  
Violence, intimidation, and vigilante conduct, § 13:23

**CLAIBORNE HARDWARE DECISION**  
Applying Brandenburg intent and Imminence standard and, § 10:28

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

**CLASSROOM DISCUSSION**  
Applications of academic freedom principle: control of, § 17:35

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

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

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

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

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

## INDEX

### **CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER**

#### **—Cont'd**

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

### **CLINICS**

- Abortion, see **Abortion Protest**

### **CLOTHING**

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

### **CLUBS**

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

### **COHEN v. CALIFORNIA**

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

### **COLLATERAL BAR RULE**

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

### **COLONIAL EXPERIENCE**

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

### **COLONIAL EXPERIENCE—Cont'd**

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

### **COLORADO II DECISION**

- "Coordinated expenditures" and, **§ 16:14.10**

### **COLORADO REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE DECISION**

- Political process (and First Amendment): "Soft Money," **§ 16:14**

### **COMMERCIAL INTEREST PROTECTION**

- Prior restraint applied in, **§ 15:59**

### **COMMERCIAL SPEECH**

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

**COMMERCIAL SPEECH—Cont'd**

- Central Hudson test, evolution of doctrine—Cont'd
- Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc. decision, § 20:8
- Decision, § 20:6
- Refinement in Board of Trustees v. Fox, § 20:7
- Commercial trafficking in records obtained from government agencies, § 20:47
- Compelled generic advertising: the Glickman decision, § 20:45
- Compelled speech v. compelled subsidies, the Johanns decision, § 19:25.50
- 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

<b>CONTENT-NEUTRAL REGULATION vs. CONTENT-BASED REGULATION—Cont'd</b>	<b>CORE PRINCIPLES</b>
Viewpoint discrimination—Cont'd discrimination: court's pronouncements in <i>R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul</i> , § 3:10	Heightened scrutiny, see <b>Heightened Scrutiny</b>
Heavy presumption against viewpoint discrimination, § 3:11	<b>CORONAVIRUS</b>
Viewpoint discrimination is subset of content discrimination, § 3:9	Pandemic restrictions, § 16:43
<i>Virginia v. Black</i> , cross-burning reprised, § 3:10.50	<b>CORPORATE SPEECH</b>
<b>CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS</b>	See also <b>Commercial Speech</b>
Expression, enforcing contracts restricting, prior restraint, § 15:59.50	Application of commercial speech doctrines and, on social and policy issues, §§ 20:16, 20:17
<b>CONTROVERSIAL POSITIONS</b>	Political, see <b>Political Financing</b>
Academic freedom and taking, see <b>Education</b>	<b>COUNTERMAN DECISION</b>
<b>CONVENTION CENTERS</b>	Clear and present danger
Public forum doctrines, § 8:30.50	True threats, Court clarifies, § 10:22.60
<b>CONVENTIONS</b>	“True threats,” Court clarifies, § 10:22.70
Regulation of political processes and: campaigns, primaries, elections, and parties, nominating conventions, § 16:30.50	Intent and imminence standard
<b>CONVERSION THERAPY</b>	True threats, § 10:22.60
Commercial speech Regulation of, § 20:32.30	“True threats,” § 10:22.70
<b>COPYRIGHT</b>	<b>COURSE CONTENT</b>
<i>Eldred v. Ashcroft</i> sustains copyright extension, § 21:7.50	Applications of academic freedom principle, § 17:34
Government as speaker: philosophi- cal issues posed, § 19:2.60	<b>COURTHOUSES AND JAILS</b>
Infringement, Internet, § 21:14	As forums, § 8:32
Preemption of copyright, “breaking news,” § 21:15	<b>COURTROOMS</b>
Prior restraint applied in cases of, § 15:60	Public forum doctrines, § 8:32.50
Tensions between intellectual prop- erty and First Amendment and duration of, § 21:7	<b>COVID-19</b>
	Pandemic restrictions, § 16:43
	<b>COWGILL DECISION</b>
	As case study on notion of “intent to communicate,” § 11:6
	<b>CRAWFORD DECISION</b>
	Political process, challenges to “Voter ID” laws, § 16:40
	<b>CRIMINAL JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS</b>
	Content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, criminalizing mere “lies,” § 3:7.50
	Press access to, see <b>Newsgathering</b>

## 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**

## FREEDOM OF SPEECH

### 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**

<b>“DO NOT CALL” LIST CONTROVERSY</b>	
Commercial speech, § 20:40.50	
<b>DOOR-TO-DOOR CANVASSING</b>	
Prior restraint doctrine, restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, § 15:54.50	
<b>DRAG PERFORMANCES</b>	
Application of current obscenity standards, Restrictions, § 14:40.50	
<b>DRESS</b>	
School regulation of, see <b>Education</b>	
<b>DRINKING</b>	
Government regulation of, see <b>Vices</b>	
<b>DRIVER’S PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT</b>	
Generally, § 24:20	
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST PROTECTION</b>	
Prior restraint applied in, § 15:59	
<b>EDENFIELD v. FANE</b>	
Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by accountants and other professional services, § 20:35	
<b>EDITOR</b>	
Government as, see <b>Government</b>	
<b>EDUCATION</b>	
Academic freedom and	
Claims of academic researcher’s privilege, § 17:38.60	
Faculty members’ speech, below	
Admissions interviews, First Amendment claims arising from, § 17:43	
Advance notice requirements prior to engaging in expressive activity, § 17:45	
Applications of academic principle	
Generally, § 17:33	
Control over classroom discussion, § 17:35	
<b>EDUCATION—Cont’d</b>	
Applications of academic principle	
—Cont’d	
Controversial or politically incorrect 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 discrimination by student groups, § 17:42	
Bullying, schools, § 17:17.50	
Clothing, school regulation of	
Regulation of clothing and related forms of expression, § 17:17	
Controversial or politically incorrect positions. Politically incorrect positions, below	
Cross-reference to public forum law	
Generally, § 17:26	
Nature of the university, § 17:27	
Overriding requirement of content neutrality, § 17:28	
Faculty members’ speech and academic freedom	
Generally, § 17:30	
Academic freedom, the First Amendment, and the Supreme Court, § 17:32	
Applications of academic principle, above	
First Amendment right to academic freedom as right separate and apart from recognized rights, § 17:31.50	
Legal sources of academic freedom, § 17:31	
First Amendment	
Admissions interviews, § 17:43	
Educational missions, § 17:1	

## 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, *Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier*, **§ 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 govern-  
ment employees for speech  
activity, when speech is disrupt-  
ive (applying balancing test),  
§ 18:20

**ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE**

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

**ETHICAL CONDUCT**

Recusal restrictions: Nevada Com-  
mission 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 require-  
ments, § 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 explicitives" 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: Hazelwood 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 EXPLOITIVES"**

- Broadcast regulation, challenges to FCC's regulation of "fleeting exploitives" 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

## FREEDOM OF SPEECH

**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  
Expedited 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  
Expedited 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 trials, § 15:28

### FROHWERK DECISION

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

### FUNDING THE ARTS

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

### FUNERALS

Limits on picketing and demonstrations, § 5:11.50

### GAMBLING

Government regulation of, see **Vices**

### GARCETTI v. CEBALLOS DECISION

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

### GENITALS

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

### GENTILE STANDARD DECISION

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

### GERRYMANDERING

Partisan, political process, § 16:42

### GIFTS

Lobbyists, § 16:20.20

### GINZBURG DECISION

Pandering concept, obscene speech and, § 14:17

### GITLOW DECISION

Bad tendency, see **Bad Tendency Concept**

### GLICKMAN DECISION

Commercial speech, compelled generic advertising, § 20:45

### GLOBE NEWSPAPER CO. v. SUPERIOR COURT

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

## 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 govern-  
 ment interest, **§ 9:10**  
 Use of racial speech by, and affirma-  
 tive action, **§ 13:18**  
 Stigmatizing governmental speech,  
**§ 13:19**  
 Use of racial speech by, and affirma-  
 tive 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 ques-  
 tions, **§ 18:12**  
 Rankin v. McPherson and rele-  
 vancy principle, **§ 18:11**  
 Speech critical of office policy  
 implicating questions of pub-  
 lic 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 perfor-  
 mance of official duties,  
**§ 18:20.60**  
 Speech not of public opinion  
 concern, below  
 Waters v. Churchill: court refines  
 framework, **§ 18:8**  
 Disruptive speech (applying balanc-  
 ing 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 perfor-  
 mance 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. Beauharanais 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. KUHLMEIER**

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

**HEALTH CARE ACTIVITIES**

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

**HECKLERS**

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

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

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

**HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY**

See also **Heightened Scrutiny Forms; Heightened Scrutiny Methodology**

## 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

**JOHANNS 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. GILLEO**  
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**

## FREEDOM OF SPEECH

### 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 independence, § 25:34

Program for the future, § 25:35

Search warrants and subpoenas, § 25:36

Press access outside judicial proceedings, § 25:13

Access to military campaigns, § 25:15

Burial of military personnel, § 25:16

Prison visitation cases, § 25:14

Press access to criminal judicial proceedings, § 25:2

Access to court documents and exhibits, § 25:8

Communicating in camera in chambers, § 25:10

Historic Richmond Newspapers decision, § 25:3

Information concerning jurors, § 25:9

Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: developments after Richmond Newspapers decision, § 25:4

Globe Newspaper Co. v. Superior Court, § 25:5

Press-Enterprise I, § 25:6

Press-Enterprise II, § 25:7

Press access to information, institutions, and events, § 25:1

Arbitration proceedings, § 25:12.50

**NEWSGATHERING (FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION)**  
**—Cont'd**

Press access to information, institutions, and events, § 25:1

—Cont'd

Civil judicial proceedings, § 25:12

Press access to juvenile proceedings, § 25:11

Press access to judicial proceedings Limiting phones and electronic devices inside courtrooms, § 25:7.50

Public interest group's surveillance cameras, removal from public parkland, § 25:16.50

Removal of surveillance cameras from public parkland, § 25:16.50

Reporter's privilege, § 25:17

General principles of modern First Amendment jurisprudence and reporter's privilege, §§ 25:27, 25:27.50

Invoking reporter's privilege, § 25:27.50

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

Sources of the privilege: shield statutes, common law, and the First Amendment, § 25:18

Reporter's privilege: ambiguous ruling in *Branzburg v. Hayes*, § 25:19

Dissents, § 25:21

Majority opinion, § 25:20

Pivotal concurring opinion of Justice Powell, § 25:22

Reporter's privilege: developments since *Branzburg*, § 25:23

Lower court decisions, § 25:26

Relevance of *Herbert v. Lando*, § 25:24

University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC dictum, § 25:25

Restrictions on reporting truthful information, § 25:38

Restrictions on reporting truthful information: emerging principle

## 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

## INDEX

**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 explicitives" 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**

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

**ONLINE COMMUNICATION**  
Generally, **§ 27:18**  
Anonymous speech online, **§ 27:19.50**  
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 meta-  
 phor, § 2:15  
 Marketplace theory's analytic  
 underpinnings, § 2:16  
 Critiques of the theory, § 2:17  
 Distinguishing process from the  
 result, § 2:18  
 Marketplace and value of open  
 process, § 2:19  
 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 pol-  
 itics as form of statism, § 2:45  
 Political and nonpolitical insepara-  
 ble, § 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 the-  
 ory, § 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 chil-  
 dren 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

<b>PERSONAL LOYALTY—Cont'd</b> is disruptive (applying balancing test), <b>§ 18:19</b>	<b>PICKETING—Cont'd</b> Restraints directed to picketing, marching or other forms of symbolic expression, <b>§ 15:53</b> Limits on picketing and public demonstrations, <b>§ 15:54</b> Picketing of abortion clinics: Madsen decision, <b>§ 15:55</b>
<b>PERVASIVENESS RATIONALE</b> Obscenity and indecency: content regulation of broadcast in <i>Pacifica</i> decision, <b>§ 26:22</b>	
<b>PETITION</b> Government employees, <b>§ 18:24</b> Political process Disclosures of petition signatures, <b>§ 16:38.50</b> Restrictions on petition circulators, <b>§ 16:38</b> Reinforcing power of right of, <b>§ 16:3</b>	<b>PICO DECISION</b> School libraries, <b>§ 17:6</b>
<b>PHARMACEUTICAL ADVERTISING</b> Commercial speech in context of professional services Off-label drug promotion and marketing, <b>§ 20:32.60</b> Thompson v. Western States, <b>§ 20:32.50</b>	<b>PLACES</b> Applicable standard to content-neutral regulation of public forum, see <b>Time, Place or Manner Standard</b> Historically dedicated to free expression, <b>§ 8:4</b>
<b>PHILOSOPHICAL PARADOX</b> Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment: policy and, <b>§ 21:2</b>	<b>PLANNED PARENTHOOD LITIGATION</b> Threats in context of political rhetoric, <b>§ 13:41.50</b>
<b>PHYSICAL HARM</b> Heightened scrutiny and, <b>§ 4:16</b>	<b>PLAYBOY ENTERTAINMENT GROUP DECISION</b> Content-based regulation of cable television, <b>§ 27:14</b>
<b>PHYSICAL OBSTRUCTION</b> In abortion protest, see <b>Abortion protest</b>	<b>POLICE ACTIVITY</b> Public forum doctrines, <b>§ 8:53</b>
<b>PICKERING DECISION</b> Disciplining government employees for speech activity: Pickering, Connick, and Waters cases, <b>§§ 18:6, 18:20.60</b> Evolution of public concern/disruption test: Pickering and Connick, <b>§ 18:7</b>	<b>POLICY</b> Disciplining government employees for speech activity Defining speech public concern: speech critical of office policy implicating questions of public accountability, <b>§ 18:12</b> When speech is disruptive (applying balancing test), <b>§ 18:20</b> Government as financier and, see <b>Financier</b> Issues of, application of commercial speech doctrines and corporate speech on, <b>§ 20:17</b> Policy paradox: tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment and philosophical and, <b>§ 21:2</b>
<b>PICKETING</b> Limits on picketing at cemeteries and funerals, <b>§ 5:11.50</b> Privacy in the home and unwanted speech near the home, <b>§ 5:11</b>	

## 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 standards: prior restraints in obscenity cases, § 14:56  
Forfeitures under RICO provisions: the Alexander decision, § 14:61  
Freedman v. Maryland requirements, § 14:58  
Other procedural safeguards: licensing procedures, § 14:59  
Other procedural safeguards: seizures of allegedly obscene material, § 14:60  
Prior restraints and nuisance statutes, § 14:62  
Requirement of immediate judicial review, § 14:57  
Use of informal pressure to censor adult material, § 14:63  
Commercial speech cases, in, § 15:62

**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 information by the press: *Pentagon Papers* decision, § 25:40  
First Amendment principles governing regulation of hate speech: racist demonstrations and prior restraints: *Skokie* case, § 12:27  
Freedman v. Maryland requirements, see **Freedman v. Maryland**  
History of, § 15:1  
Overview of current doctrines, § 15:7  
Prior 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 disfavorable treatment, **§ 22:14**

### PROPAGANDIST

Philosophical issues posed in government as, in *Meese v. Keene* and government as propagandist Generally, **§ 19:5**

Critical view of the case, **§ 19:7**  
Holding in the case, **§ 19:6**

### 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 regulations, **§ 8:38**
  - Regulation must be narrowly tailored to serve significant government interest. Narrow tailoring of regulation, above Small gatherings, **§ 8:48.20**
  - Standards, external vs. internal in public forum definition and regulation, **§ 8:15.60**
- Symbolic speech: application of public forum law principles to "Occupy Wall Street" and other "Occupy Movement" issues, **§ 11:29**
- Takeover of public forums for private events, **§ 8:34**
- Televised political debates: the Forbes decision, **§ 8:52**

### **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 permissible time, place, or manner regulations to control environmental concerns, **§ 8:48.10**

### **PUBLIC INDECENCY**

- Overview, **§ 14:2**

### **PUBLIC INTEREST GROUP**

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

**PUBLICITY, RIGHT OF**

First Amendment and privacy, § 24:4

**PUBLIC MATCHING FUNDS**

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

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, physical 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 governing 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 proscribability of the class, **§ 12:18**

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

#### **—Cont'd**

First Amendment principles governing 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 activity, **§ 8:53**

### **RECREATIONAL DANCING**

Two-step inquiry in application of modern symbolic speech principles, critical content theory, **§ 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 restraints in obscenity cases: application of current obscenity standards, forfeitures under RICO provisions in the Alexander 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 distinction, **§ 7:6**  
    Application of the doctrine, **§ 7:7**  
    Rough proportionality standard of Dolan v. City of Tigard, **§ 7:14**  
    Summary: pliability of the doctrine, **§ 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 dissent, **§ 14:11**  
Link between Roth and Chaplinsky, **§ 14:8**  
Not all sexual speech is obscene: Roth and prurient interest standard, **§ 14:9**  
Obscenity not protected by First Amendment, **§ 14:7**  
Roth rejection of Hicklin test, **§ 14:10**  
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 writing 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 permissible 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 tendency” 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 independence, **§ 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 doctrine: Renton case, **§ 9:19**

Content-neutrality, O’Brien test and placing limits on the doctrine, **§ 9:20**

Question of doctrine limited to sexually oriented establishments 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, *Barnticki 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 doctrine, § 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 regulation—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 establishments 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 correct 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 expressive 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 communicate,” § 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 Regulation 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 restrictions 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 standards to: attempts to restrict

## FREEDOM OF SPEECH

### **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 statement, **§ 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 litigation, **§ 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 contribution 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 writing 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**