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**

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

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

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
Governmental use of racial speech and, see Government

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

AIRSPACE ABOVE BEACHES
As forums, **§ 8:18.10**

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

ANTIMASK LEGISLATION
Case study in determining content neutrality in context of symbolic speech, **§ 11:25**

ANTITRUST LAWS
Press and, **§§ 22:21, 22:22**

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

APPELLATE REVIEW PRINCIPLE
Roth and independent, **§ 14:16**

APPROPRIATION (THE RIGHT OF PUBLICITY)
First Amendment and privacy, **§ 24:4**
Prior restraint, **§§ 15:58.30, 15:58.70**

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

ARIZONA FREE ENTERPRISE CLUB'S FREEDOM CLUB PAC v. BENNETT
Public matching funds to level the playing field, **§ 16:21.50**

ARTS
Funding of, by government, see Funding the Arts
Government as librarian, curator, and arts impresario, **§§ 19:15 to 19:20, 19:23**

ASHCROFT v. ACLU
Obscene (and pornographic) speech, community standards and internet, **§ 14:66**

ASSEMBLY
Brandenburg standard and unlawful assembly, **§ 10:36.60**
Reinforcing power of right of, **§ 16:3**

ASSOCIATION
Education and problem of forcing inclusion, **§ 17:41**
Membership eligibility discrimination by student groups, **§ 17:42**
Reinforcing power of right of, **§ 16:3**

ATTORNEYS
Bar admission regulations, **§ 20:27.50**
Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by
Generally, **§ 20:28**
Ohralik and Primus decisions, **§ 20:29**

ATTORNEYS—Cont'd
Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by —Cont'd
Regulation of lawyer blogs, **§ 20:31.30**
Specialty advertising, **§ 20:31**
Thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, **§ 20:30**
Directories that sell advertising, **§ 20:31.40**
Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press, disciplinary proceedings, **§ 25:43.50**
Judicial proceedings and gag orders
Generally, **§ 15:45**
Lower court decisions on attorney gag orders, **§ 15:45**
Restrictions on books written by attorneys on their cases, **§ 15:46**
Professional directories that sell advertising, **§ 20:31.40**

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

AUTOPSY PHOTOGRAPHS
Privacy (and related torts), **§ 24:6.50**

AVERTING EYES
See Captive Audience

BAD TENDENCY CONCEPT
Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of, **§ 10:7**
Brandeis opinion in Whitney, **§ 10:13**
Holmes dissent in Abrams v. United States, **§ 10:8**
Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of "bad tendency" in Gitlow decision
Generally, **§ 10:9**
Applying First Amendment to the states, **§ 10:10**

BAD TENDENCY CONCEPT —Cont'd
Beginnings of: Holmes and Brandeis dissents, repudiation of "bad tendency" in Gitlow decision —Cont'd
Deferring to legislative determinations that clear and present danger exists, **§ 10:11**
Holmes and Brandeis dissents, **§ 10:12**
In Schenck decision, **§ 10:4**

BALLOTS
Disclosure, **§ 16:31.50**
Regulation of elections and access to, racial exclusions, **§ 16:26**
Regulation of elections and restrictions on access to, **§ 16:27**

BANKRUPTCY AND DEBT RELIEF
Commercial speech in context of professional services, **§ 20:31.50**

BANS
Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by attorneys: thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, **§ 20:30**
First Amendment ban on discrimination among different media, **§ 22:19**
Smoking ban, application of modern symbolic speech principles, **§ 11:23.60**

BARNTICKI v. VOPPER
Illegal interception of electronic material, **§ 25:45.50**
Trafficking in truthful information, **§ 25:45.60**

BEAUHARNAIS DECISION
First Amendment principles governing regulation of: historical background of group libel and, **§ 12:6**
Analysis of Beauharnais, **§ 12:7**
Beauharnais and outmoded categorical approach to First

BEAUHARNAIS DECISION —Cont'd
First Amendment principles governing regulation of: historical background of group libel and, **§ 12:6**—Cont'd
Amendment jurisprudence, **§ 12:9**
Group libel, infliction of emotional distress, and individual libel compared, **§ 12:8**

BEEF CHECKOFF PROGRAM
Johanns decision
Compelled speech, **§ 19:25.50**
Government speech, **§§ 4:27.60, 20:45.60**

BELOTTI DECISION
Regulation of corporate political speech, **§ 16:16**

BILL OF RIGHTS
Adoption of, **§ 1:7**
Relevance of federalism, **§ 1:9**
Restatement or rebellion, **§ 1:8**

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

BLOCKING
Unwanted mail, see Mail

BOARD OF TRUSTEES v. FOX
Evolution of commercial speech doctrine: refinement in, **§ 20:7**

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

BONG HITS 4 JESUS DECISION
School-sanctioned events, Morse v. Frederick, **§ 17:4.50**

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

BORDER SEARCHES
Clear and present danger, **§ 10:20.60**

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

BRANTI v. FINKEL
Political speech and government employees: patronage cases, **§ 16:6**

BRANZBURG v. HAYES
Reporter's privilege: ambiguous 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 explictives" 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**

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 codes as speech, **§ 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 Hampsire, **§ 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

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 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**

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 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**
Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc. decision, **§ 20:8**
Decision, **§ 20:6**

COMMERCIAL SPEECH—Cont'd
Central Hudson test, evolution of doctrine—Cont'd
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, statute 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**
Illegal activities or false and misleading activities, regulation of the speech involving
Generally, **§ 20:13**

COMMERCIAL SPEECH—Cont'd
Illegal activities or false and misleading activities, regulation of the speech involving—Cont'd
Distinguishing inherently misleading from potentially misleading advertising, **§ 20:15**
Illegal activity, **§ 20:16**
Misleading activities, **§ 20:14**
Informed consent statutes, **§ 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**
Mandatory disclosures to government available to the public, **§ 20:45.80**
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 statutes 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**

COMMERCIAL SPEECH—Cont'd
Professional services—Cont'd
Thirty-day bans on direct-mail solicitations following accidents, **§ 20:30**
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 (CDA)
Cable television, immunity, **§ 27:27**
Electronic media, free speech on the internet, **§ 27:20**
Immunity, **§ 27:27**

COMMUNISTS
Evolution toward rigorous clear and present danger test in prosecution of (1950s), **§ 10:17**
Communist prosecutions legacy, **§ 10:20**

COMMUNISTS—Cont'd
Evolution toward rigorous clear and present danger test in prosecution of (1950s), **§ 10:17**
—Cont'd
Distinguishing between advocacy and action in Yates, Scales, 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 vs.

CONTENT NEUTRALITY—Cont'd
Content-Based Regulation
Hate speech on campus and, **§ 17:28**
Permit rules, Thomas v. Chicago Park District , prior restraint doctrine, **§ 15:71.50**
Public forums, see Public Forum Doctrines
Regulation
Incidental, see United States v. O'Brien standard
Of speech permitted under O'Brien test, see United States v. O'Brien standard
Public forum and, **§§ 8:35 to 8:50, 8:48.20**
See also Public forum doctrines
Small gatherings, **§ 8:48.20**
Summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to hate speech and protection, of persons or property, **§ 12:24**
Symbolic speech and, see Symbolic speech
Traditional public forum, **§ 8:6**
Time, place, or manner, see Time, Place, or Manner Regulations
University of Wisconsin hate speech regulation, content neutrality analysis by court, **§ 17:23**

CONTENT-NEUTRAL REGULATION vs. CONTENT-BASED REGULATION
Bivens, purposeful discrimination requirements, **§ 3:6.40**
Civil rights laws, purposeful discrimination requirements, **§ 3:6.40**
Content-based regulation vs., **§ 2:66**
Criminalizing mere ''lies,'' Stolen Valor Act example, **§ 3:7.50**
Event-based discrimination, **§ 3:4.75**
Governmental entities themselves possess no free speech rights, **§ 3:13**
Harm of content-neutral vs. content-based laws, **§ 3:2**

CONTENT-NEUTRAL REGULATION vs. CONTENT-BASED REGULATION—Cont'd
Impersonation of police and other government officials, **§ 3:7.60**
Inquiry into justifying regulation without reference to message content, **§ 3:3**
Distinguishing content from mode of expression, **§ 3:4.50**
Examining justification for the regulation, **§ 3:4**
Mixed motive cases, **§ 3:4.30**
Inquiry into justifying regulation without reference to message content: law may be content-based even in absence of ''invidious intent to discriminate or censor,'' **§ 3:5**
Distinguishing ''justifications based upon content'' from ''intent to censor,'' **§ 3:6**
Finding content discrimination in absence of intent to censor: Simon & Schuster decision, **§ 3:7**
Law enforcement and other government officials, impersonation, **§ 3:7.60**
Purposeful discrimination requirements of § 1983, Bivens, and other civil rights laws, **§ 3:6.40**
Relaxing prohibition on viewpoint discrimination when government is speaker, **§ 3:12**
Retaliation claims, **§ 3:14**
§ 1983 and other civil rights laws, purposeful discrimination requirements, **§ 3:6.40**
Stolen Valor Act, criminalizing mere ''lies,'' **§ 3:7.50**
Two tracks of judicial review in distinguishing, **§ 3:1**
United States v. Alvarez, criminalizing mere ''lies,'' **§ 3:7.50**
Viewpoint discrimination
Generally, **§ 3:8**
Distinguishing content discrimination from viewpoint

CONTENT-NEUTRAL REGULATION vs. CONTENT-BASED REGULATION—Cont'd
Viewpoint discrimination—Cont'd
discrimination: court's pronouncements in R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, **§ 3:10**
Heavy presumption against viewpoint discrimination, **§ 3:11**
Viewpoint discrimination is subset of content discrimination, **§ 3:9**
Virginia v. Black , cross-burning reprised, **§ 3:10.50**

CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS
Expression, enforcing contracts restricting, prior restraint, **§ 15:59.50**

CONTROVERSIAL POSITIONS
Academic freedom and taking, see Education

CONVENTION CENTERS
Public forum doctrines, **§ 8:30.50**

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

CONVERSION THERAPY
Commercial speech
Statutes, **§ 20:32.30**

COPYRIGHT
Eldred v. Ashcroft sustains copyright extension, **§ 21:7.50**
Government as speaker: philosophical issues posed, **§ 19:2.60**
Infringement, Internet, **§ 21:14**
Preemption of copyright, ''breaking news,'' **§ 21:15**
Prior restraint applied in cases of, **§ 15:60**
Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment and duration of, **§ 21:7**

CORE PRINCIPLES
Heightened scrutiny, see Heightened Scrutiny

CORONAVIRUS
Pandemic restrictions, **§ 16:43**

CORPORATE SPEECH
See also Commercial Speech
Application of commercial speech doctrines and, on social and policy issues, **§§ 20:16, 20:17**
Political, see Political Financing

COUNTERMAN DECISION
Clear and present danger
True threats, Court clarifies, **§ 10:22.60**
''True threats,'' Court clarifies, **§ 10:22.70**
Intent and imminence standard
True threats, **§ 10:22.60**
''True threats,'' **§ 10:22.70**

COURSE CONTENT
Applications of academic freedom principle, **§ 17:34**

COURTHOUSES AND JAILS
As forums, **§ 8:32**

COURTROOMS
Public forum doctrines, **§ 8:32.50**

COVID-19
Pandemic restrictions, **§ 16:43**

COWGILL DECISION
As case study on notion of ''intent to communicate,'' **§ 11:6**

CRAWFORD DECISION
Political process, challenges to ''Voter ID'' laws, **§ 16:40**

CRIMINAL JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS
Content-neutral regulation vs. content-based regulation, criminalizing mere ''lies,'' **§ 3:7.50**
Press access to, see Newsgathering

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

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

CRITICAL MASS THEORY
In determining whether facility is nonforum: requirement of intent to create designated public forum, **§ 8:15**

CRITICAL RACE THEORY
Education, **§ 17:34.30**

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

CURATOR
Government as, see Government

CURRENT OBSCENITY STANDARDS
Application of, see Obscene Speech

DAMAGE TO PROPERTY
In abortion protest, see Abortion Protest

DANCE CLUBS
Application of current obscenity standards to, **§ 14:37**

DANCE CLUBS—Cont'd
Question of secondary effects doctrine limited to sexually oriented, **§ 9:21**

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

DATABASES
Commercial speech, **§ 20:48**

DAVIS v. FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Political processes and elections, "Millionaires Amendment," **§ 16:21**

DEBS DECISION
Beginnings of clear and present danger test and, **§ 10:6**

DEBT RELIEF SERVICES
Commercial speech in context of professional services, **§ 20:31.50**

DEFAMATION
Creation of First Amendment standards for libel, **§ 23:1**
Actual malice standard, **§ 23:3**
Facts and holding of New York Times case, **§ 23:2**
Government, no libel against, **§ 23:3.50**
Definition of public official, **§ 23:3.75**
Equal opportunities for access in broadcast: absolute protection against defamation liability, **§ 26:14**
Food disparagement laws, proliferation of, **§ 23:13**
Foreign libel judgments, enforcement, **§ 23:14**
Matters of public concern standard, **§ 23:5**

DEFAMATION—Cont'd
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**
Pursuit of enlightened public policy, **§ 2:34**

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

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

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

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

DEPICTION
Obscene, see Obscene Speech

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

DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY
Abortion protest and prohibited, **§ 13:28**

DIAL-A-PORN
Application of current obscenity standards to, **§ 14:41**

DIRECT BROADCAST SATELLITE (DBS)
Cable television, **§ 27:16**

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,'' nondisclosure requirements, prior restraint, **§ 15:22.50**
Political process, petition signatures, **§ 16:38.50**

DISCOVERY NETWORK DECISION
See Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc.

DISCRIMINATION
Conduct, summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to hate speech and, **§ 12:25**
Content, see entries beginning with terms: Content
Purposeful discrimination requirements, civil rights laws, **§ 3:6.40**

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

DISRUPTIVE SPEECH
By government employees, see Government Employees
Student, Bethel School District v. Fraser, **§ 17:4**

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

DOCTRINE
See also specific doctrines
Of free speech, generally, **§ 2:13**
See also Free Speech

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

DOLAN v. CITY OF TIGARD
Rough proportionality standard of, **§ 7:14**

DOMESTIC RELATIONS
Prior restraint doctrine, **§ 15:58.70**

DONORS
Forced disclosure, heightened scrutiny, **§ 4:32**

"DO NOT CALL" LIST CONTROVERSY
Commercial speech, **§ 20:40.50**

DOOR-TO-DOOR CANVASSING
Prior restraint doctrine, restraints directed to picketing, marching, or other forms of symbolic expression, **§ 15:54.50**

DRAG PERFORMANCES
Application of current obscenity standards, Restrictions, **§ 14:40.50**

DRESS
School regulation of, see Education

DRINKING
Government regulation of, see Vices

DRIVER'S PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT
Generally, **§ 24:20**

ECONOMIC INTEREST PROTECTION
Prior restraint applied in, **§ 15:59**

EDENFIELD v. FANE
Commercial speech in context of advertising and solicitation by accountants and other professional services, **§ 20:35**

EDITOR
Government as, see Government

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

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

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

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

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

EICHMAN DECISION
Flag desecration and, see Flag Desecration Cases

ELDRED V. ASHCROFT
Copyright extension, sustaining, **§ 21:7.50**

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

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

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

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

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

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Activities at, Hazlewood v. Kihlmeier, **§ 17:10**

ELROD v. BURNS
Political speech and government employees: patronage cases, **§ 16:5**

EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
Group libel, individual libel and infliction of, compared, **§ 12:8**
Privacy and infliction of, **§ 24:7**
Hustler background, **§ 24:10**
Hustler opinion, **§ 24:11**
Hustler v. Falwell litigation, **§ 24:9**
Overview of the tort, **§ 24:8**

EMOTION PRINCIPLE
As core principle in heightened scrutiny, **§ 4:9**
Cohen v. California decision, **§ 4:11**
Hustler Magazine v. Falwell decision, **§ 4:12**
Inroads on emotion principle, **§ 4:13**
Protecting emotional as well as intellectual components of speech, **§ 4:10**
Relationship of, to court's discussion of viewpoint discrimination in R.A.V. decision, **§ 12:20**

EMPLOYEES
Government, see Government Employees

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION
Hostile environment cases in
Generally, **§§ 13:2 to 13:17**
Hostile environment cases under Title VII, **§§ 13:3 to 13:17**
Title VII and First Amendment reconciliation, below
Insult and innuendo distinction from protected speech
Generally, **§ 13:8**
Speech causing dysfunction in workplace and merely offensive speech, **§ 13:9**

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION—Cont'd
Insult and innuendo distinction from protected speech—Cont'd
Whether offensive speech principles applicable in marketplace apply to speech in the workplace. Workplace vs. marketplace, below
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**

ENFORCEMENT—Cont'd
Expression, contracts restricting, prior restraint, **§ 15:59.50**

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS
See Time, Place, or Manner Regulations

ENVIRONMENTAL PURPOSES
See Commercial Speech

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

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES
Content regulation of political campaigns and, see Broadcast Regulation

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

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

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

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

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

EXHIBITION OF GENITALS
Patently offensive depictions or descriptions, Miller test, **§ 14:31**

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

EXPEDITIOUS JUDICIAL REVIEW
Procedural issues concerning prior restraints: Freedman requirements, **§ 15:65**

EXPERT WITNESSES
Bans on state employees serving as, **§ 18:23**

EXPRESSIVE CONDUCT
Symbolic speech and, see Symbolic Speech

EYES
Averting, see Captive Audience

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

FACULTY MEMBERS
Speech by, see Education

FAIRGROUNDS
Pedestrian malls, **§ 8:18.30**
Public forum doctrines, **§ 8:18.30**
Urban plazas, **§ 8:18.30**

FAIRNESS DOCTRINE
And administrative and political roller coaster after Red Lion, **§ 26:10**
Content regulation of broadcast, and related issues: Red Lion decision, **§ 26:5**

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

FAIR USE
Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment: free speech safety valve in, **§ 21:10**
Fair use and parody, **§ 21:12**
Harper & Row decision, **§ 21:11**

FAIR WARNING REQUIREMENT
Narrowing construction saving overboard laws and, **§ 6:10**

FALSE LIGHT INVASION OF PRIVACY
First Amendment and, **§ 24:3**

FALSE STATEMENT OF FACT
Requirement of, for defamation, **§ 23:6**
Clear and convincing evidence standard, **§ 23:7.50**
Falsity: Hepps decision, **§ 23:7**
Notion of ''substantial truth,'' **§ 23:8**
Stolen Valor Act, criminalizing mere ''lies,'' **§ 3:7.50**

FCC (FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION)
Broadcast regulation, challenges to FCC's regulation of ''fleeting explictives'' as indecency, **§ 26:28**

FCC (FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION)—Cont'd
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 decision, **§ 19:13**
Proportionality principle: Regan v. Taxation with Representation decision, **§ 19:12**
Proportionality principle: Rust v. Sullivan decision, **§ 19:14**

FINANCING
Political, see Political Financing

FINLEY v. NEA
Government funding the arts and, **§ 19:20**

FIRST AMENDMENT
See Transgender
Absolute principles embraced by, **§ 2:54**
Academic freedom, **§ 17:31**
Right separate and apart from recognized rights, **§ 17:31.50**
Supreme Court and, **§ 17:32**
Activities at high schools and elementary schools: Hazlewood v. Kuhlmeier , censorship of school newspaper in violation of First Amendment, **§ 17:10.50**
Admissions interviews, claims arising from, **§ 17:43**
And educational missions, **§ 17:1**
See also Education
And history of prior restraint, **§ 15:2**
Applying, to the states, Gitlow and, **§ 10:9**
Cable television: Turner Broadcasting decision, **§ 27:10**
Cross-reference to general principles of, governing restrictions on dissemination of truthful information, and judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, **§ 15:43**
Defamation and, see Defamation
Emergence of meaningful protection for vitriolic dissent under, De Jonge decision, **§ 10:15**
Gender transition procedures, **§ 13:44**
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**

FIRST AMENDMENT—Cont'd
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
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**
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 EXPLICTIVES"
Broadcast regulation, challenges to FCC's regulation of "fleeting explictives" 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 compensation cases, **§ 7:12**

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

FREEDMAN v. MARYLAND
Generally, **§ 15:65**
Adversary hearing, necessity of
Generally, **§§ 15:68, 15:69**
Ex parte orders, **§ 15:70**
Burden of licensing authority, **§ 15:67**
Content-neutral permit rules, Thomas v. Chicago Park District, **§ 15:71.50**
Expeditious judicial review, **§ 15:71**
Freedman decision, **§ 15:66**

FREEDMAN v. MARYLAND —Cont'd
Prior restraints in obscenity cases: application of current obscenity standards, **§ 14:58**
Procedural issues concerning prior restraints: requirements of, **§ 15:65**
Adversary hearing, necessity of, above
Burden of licensing authority, **§ 15:67**
Expeditious judicial review, **§ 15:71**
In the case, **§ 15:66**

FREEDOM OF ACCESS TO CLINIC ENTRANCES ACT OF 1994
Abortion protest and, see Abortion Protest

FREE PRESS
Judicial proceedings, prior restraints and, and fair trails, **§ 15:28**

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

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

FUNERALS
Limits on picketing and demonstrations, **§ 5:11.50**

GAMBLING
Government regulation of, see Vices

GARCETTI v. CEBALLOS DECISION
Government employees, speech pursuant to official duties, **§ 18:8.50**

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

GENTILE STANDARD DECISION
Judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, **§ 15:46**

GERRYMANDERING
Partisan, political process, **§ 16:42**

GIFTS
Lobbyists, **§ 16:20.20**

GINZBURG DECISION
Pandering concept, obscene speech and, **§ 14:17**

GITLOW DECISION
Bad tendency, see Bad Tendency Concept

GLICKMAN DECISION
Commercial speech, compelled generic advertising, **§ 20:45**

GLOBE NEWSPAPER CO. v. SUPERIOR COURT
Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: developments after Richmond Newspapers, **§ 25:5**

GOOD NEWS DECISION
Clubs and organizations meeting after school, **§ 8:22**

GOVERNMENT
Absence of free speech rights of governmental entities, **§ 3:13**
Ad hoc balancing unfairly weighted in favor of legislative judgments, **§ 2:60**
As educator, see Education
As financier of speech, **§ 19:8**
As financier of speech: policy and doctrinal tensions, **§ 19:9**
Neutrality principle, **§ 19:10**
Proportionality principle, **§ 19:11**
Proportionality principle: FCC v. League of Women Voters decision, **§ 19:13**
Proportionality principle: Regan v. Taxation with Representation decision, **§ 19:12**
Proportionality principle: Rust v. Sullivan decision, **§ 19:14**

GOVERNMENT—Cont'd
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**
As speaker: philosophical issues posed
Generally, **§§ 19:2 to 19:7**
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**
Speech can be simultaneously "government" and "private," **§ 19:2.75**
Supreme Court rejection of notion of political establishment clause, **§ 19:4**
Trademark, **§ 19:2.60**

GOVERNMENT—Cont'd
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**
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-

GOVERNMENT—Cont'd
ment interest, **§ 9:10**
Use of racial speech by, and affirmative action, **§ 13:18**
Stigmatizing governmental speech, **§ 13:19**
Use of racial speech by, and affirmative action: benign use of racial speech by government, **§ 13:20**
Adarand Constructors v. Pena: overruling of Metro, **§ 13:22**
Metro Broadcasting decision, **§ 13:21**
Vs. speakers, multiple rationales to defend free speech and, **§ 2:38**

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

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

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES —Cont'd
Lane v. Franks , judicial testimony, **§ 18:9.40**
Objections, religious, to performance of official duties, **§ 18:20.60**
Official duties, speech pursuant to, **§ 18:8.50**
Overview: right/privilege revisited, **§ 18:1**
Petitions clauses claims, **§ 18:24**
Political financing, see Political Financing
Political patronage cases
Generally, **§ 18:2**
Political speech and patronage cases, below
Political speech and patronage cases
Generally, **§ 16:4**
Branti v. Finkel, **§ 16:6**
Elrod v. Burns, **§ 16:5**
Heffernan v. City of Paterson, N.J., **§ 16:7.10**
Rutan v. Republic Party of Illinois, **§ 16:7**
Preclearance procedures for, in national security cases
Generally, **§ 15:24**
Lower court decisions, **§ 15:26**
Snepp decision, **§ 15:25**
Proving causation in government employee cases: Mt. Healthy standard, **§ 18:25**
Questions of law or fact, **§ 18:26**
Regulating honoraria and royalties from outside speaking and 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**

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

GRADING POLICY AND STANDARDS
Applications of academic freedom principle, **§ 17:34.50**

GRAND JURIES
Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful 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**
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**

HATE SPEECH—Cont'd
University of Wisconsin litigation. See Education

HAZLEWOOD v. KUHLMEIER
Activities at high schools and elementary schools, **§ 17:10**

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

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

HEFFERNAN v. CITY OF PATERSON, N.J.
Political speech and government employees: discipline cases, **§ 16:7.10**

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

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

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

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

HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY METHODOLOGY
Generally, **§§ 2:12, 2:61**
Defining heightened scrutiny, **§ 2:62**
Permutations of heightened scrutiny, **§ 2:63**

HEPPS DECISION
Defamation and requirement of false statement and fact, **§ 23:7**

HERBERT v. LANDO
Reporter's privilege: developments since Brazburg, **§ 25:24**

HERNDON v. LOWRY
Road to Brandenburg and, **§ 10:16**

HESS v. INDIANA
Applying Brandenburg intent and imminence standard in, **§ 10:27**

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

HIERARCHY OF GOVERNMENTAL INTERESTS
Heightened scrutiny and, **§ 4:19**

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

HISTORY
Abortion protest, see Abortion Protest
Clear and present danger test, **§ 10:2**
FCC regulation of cable, **§ 27:6**
First Amendment, see First Amendment Background
Group libel and Beauharnais decision, see Beauharnais Decision
Meaning of press clause: text of First Amendment and uncertain historical evidence, **§ 22:4**
Obscene speech, see Obscene Speech
Of cable television, **§ 27:2**
Of prior restraint, see Prior Restraint
Places historically dedicated to free expression, **§ 8:4**

HOBBIE v. UNEMPLOYMENT APPEALS COMMISSION
Unconstitutional conditions doctrine: special note on unemployment compensation cases, **§ 7:11**

HOME
Privacy in, see Captive Audience
Privacy of, current obscenity standards and, see Stanley v. Georgia

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

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

HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT CASES
Education, schools, **§ 17:17.50**
In employment discrimination, see Employment Discrimination

HUMAN DIGNITY AND SELF-FULFILLMENT THEORY
Freedom of speech as end in itself, **§ 2:21**
Of free speech, generally, **§ 2:5**

HUSTLER MAGAZINE v. FALWELL
Emotion principle in, **§ 4:12**
Infliction of emotional distress and, **§ 24:9**
Hustler background, **§ 24:10**
Hustler opinion, **§ 24:11**

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

IDEA-EXPRESSION
Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment and balance between, **§ 21:5**
Justified balancing in favor of free speech in wedding of, **§ 21:8**

IDEA(S)
See also Free speech; and entries beginning with term: Content
Mere opposition to, not enough to justify abridgement of speech, **§ 4:7**

IDENTIFICATION CARDS
Sex offenders, **§ 4:31**

IDENTITY
Crawford decision, challenges to "Voter ID" laws, **§ 16:40**
Privacy and identity theft, **§ 24:19**

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

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, statutes, **§ 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**

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY —Cont'd
Definitional balance—Cont'd
Justified balancing in favor of free speech: wedding of idea and expression, **§ 21:8**
Privacy, constitutional right to informational privacy, **§ 21:4.50**
Unjustified balancing in favor of free speech, **§ 21:9**
Fair use: free speech safety valve, **§ 21:10**
Fair use and parody, **§ 21:12**
Harper & Row decision, **§ 21:11**
Internet and copyright infringement, **§ 21:14**
Prior restraint applied in, **§ 15:60**
Privacy of information, constitutional right to, **§ 21:4.50**
Religious disputes and, **§ 21:13**
Tensions between the amendment and, **§ 21:1**
Appropriate definitional balance. Definitional balance, above
Philosophical and policy paradox, **§ 21:2**
Trademarks, offensive or disparaging, **§ 21:16**

INTENT
Determining whether facility is nonforum: Supreme court emphasis on, **§ 8:14**
Imminence and, see Intent and Imminence Standard
Requirement of, in applying Brandenburg standard, **§ 10:34**

INTENT AND IMMINENCE STANDARD
Applying Brandenburg standard: immediacy and likelihood requirements, **§ 10:29**
Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine, **§ 10:30**
Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine in Chaplinsky case, **§ 10:32**
Brandenburg modification of fighting words doctrine in

INTENT AND IMMINENCE STANDARD—Cont'd
Applying Brandenburg standard: immediacy and likelihood requirements, **§ 10:29**—Cont'd
Chaplinsky case: modification of Chaplinsky fighting words concept, **§ 10:33**
Importance of demonstrating imminent harm, **§ 10:30**
In Brandenburg, **§ 10:21**
Bond and Watts decisions, **§ 10:22**
In Brandenburg: applying the standard, **§ 10:26**
Applied in Hess v. Indiana, **§ 10:27**
Claiborne Hardware decision, **§ 10:28**
In Brandenburg: the decision, **§ 10:23**
Brandenburg test a version of clear and present danger test, **§ 10:25**
Facts and holding, **§ 10:24**
In Counterman decision
True threats, **§ 10:22.60**
"True threats," **§ 10:22.70**
True threats
The Counterman decision, **§ 10:22.60**
"True threats," **§ 10:22.50**
The Counterman decision, **§ 10:22.70**

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

INTERFERE
Abortion protest and prohibited intent to, **§ 13:29**

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

INTERNET
Anonymous speech online, **§ 27:19.50**

INTERNET—Cont'd
Child Online Protection Act, **§ 27:22.50**
Community standards and: Ashcroft v. ACLU, **§ 14:66**
Content decision regulation, **§ 8:33.21**
Copyright
Infringement, **§ 21:14**
Preemption, **§ 21:15**
Domain names, **§ 27:25**
Filtering software, **§ 27:22.75**
Free speech on, **§ 27:17**
ACLU v. Reno decision, **§ 27:21**
Anonymous speech online, **§ 27:19.50**
Communications Decency Act, **§ 27:20**
On-line communication, **§ 27:18**
Regulation of internet, generally, **§§ 27:19, 27:20 to 27:22**
Lawyer blogs, specific contexts of professional services, **§ 20:31.30**
Pop-up advertising, **§ 27:26**
Public forum doctrines, websites, **§ 8:33.20**
Restricting research on, **§ 17:39**
School-related off-campus Internet posting, disciplining student for, **§ 17:4.70**
Social media accounts, public officeholders, **§ 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
Audio recording without consent, **§ 24:6.20**
First amendment and privacy, **§ 24:6**
Audio recording without consent, **§ 24:6.20**

JOHANNS DECISION
Compelled speech, **§ 19:25.50**

JOHANNS DECISION—Cont'd
Government speech, **§§ 4:27.60, 20:45.60**

JOHNSON DECISION
Flag desecration and, see Flag Desecration Cases

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

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

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

JUDICIAL OFFICERS
Political affiliation, **§ 16:7.20**

JUDICIAL OPINIONS
First Amendment protection for statements in judicial opinions, **§ 16:32.60**

JUDICIAL REVIEW
Prior restraints, current and obscenity standards and requirement of immediate, **§ 14:57**

JUDITH MILLER LITIGATION DECISION
Newsgathering (First Amendment protection), **§ 25:26.50**

JURISPRUDENCE
Distinguishing free speech theory, method, and doctrine in modern, **§ 2:1**

JURISPRUDENCE—Cont'd
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**

LANDMARK COMMUNICATIONS DECISION—Cont'd

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**

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**
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**

LICENSE PLATES—Cont'd
Sons of Confederate Veterans license plate case, defining government speech, **§ 19:2.50**

LICENSES
Education, requirement challenges, **§ 17:44**

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

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

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

LITERATURE
Distribution of anonymous political, **§ 16:37**

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

LITIGATION
Gag orders on participants in, see Prior Restraint

LOANS
Candidates to campaigns, political financing, **§ 16:21.30**

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

LOCAL AND STATE LAWS
Understanding the O'Brien test, prong one as constitutional power application to, **§ 9:9**

LOYALTY OATHS
Regulation of elections and, **§ 16:29**

MADSEN v. WOMEN'S HEALTH CENTER
No protection for use of force, threat of force, physical obstruction, or

MADSEN v. WOMEN'S HEALTH CENTER—Cont'd
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 OF IDEAS THEORY—Cont'd
Analytic underpinnings of, **§ 2:16**—Cont'd
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
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**
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**
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**

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**

NEAR v. MINNESOTA—Cont'd
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**
Prior restraint, **§ 15:29**
Judicial proceedings and application of the standard, **§ 15:30**

NEUTRALITY PRINCIPLE
As core principle in heightened scrutiny, **§ 4:6**
All laws must be viewpoint-neutral, **§ 4:8**
Mere opposition to idea not enough to justify abridgement of speech, **§ 4:7**
Government as speech financier: policy and doctrinal tensions and, **§ 19:10**

NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS v. CARRIGAN
Ethics and recusal restrictions, **§ 16:36.50**

NEWS AGGREGATOR
Intellectual property, copyright preemption, **§ 21:15**

NEWSGATHERING (FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION)
Access by the public to institutional press, **§ 25:46**
Broadcast model: Red Lion decision, **§ 25:48**
Print model: Miami Herald decision, **§ 25:47**
Arbitration proceedings, press access to information, institutions, and events, **§ 25:12.50**
Criminal prosecution for publishing national security information, **§ 25:45.70**
Electronic device bans, courtrooms, **§ 25:7.50**
Intercepted electronic material (illegal interception), Barnticki v. Vopper, **§ 25:45.50**
Judith Miller Litigation, **§ 25:26.50**
"Lawfully obtained" information, Barnticki v. Vopper, **§ 25:45.60**
Media: "ride-alongs," **§ 25:37.50**
National security information, publishing, **§ 25:45.70**
Newsroom searches and subpoenas, **§ 25:29**
Search warrants, **§ 25:30**
Statutory and regulatory restraints, **§ 25:32**
Subpoenas, **§ 25:31**
Newsroom searches and subpoenas: case for evolving greater First Amendment restraints on searches and subpoenas, **§ 25:33**
Material generated by the press, **§ 25:37**
Pressures on journalistic independence, **§ 25:34**
Program for the future, **§ 25:35**
Search warrants and subpoenas, **§ 25:36**
Press access outside judicial proceedings, **§ 25:13**
Access to military campaigns, **§ 25:15**

NEWSGATHERING (FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION) —Cont'd
Press access outside judicial proceedings, **§ 25:13**—Cont'd
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**
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**

NEWSGATHERING (FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION) —Cont'd
Reporter's privilege, **§ 25:17** —Cont'd
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 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**
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

OBSCENE (AND PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH —Cont'd
Application of current obscenity standards—Cont'd
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**
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**

OBSCENE (AND PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH —Cont'd
Historical overview of freedom of speech and: developments from Roth and Miller, **§ 14:12** —Cont'd
Supreme Court's per curiam period, **§ 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 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**

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

OBSCENE (AND PORNOGRAPHIC) SPEECH —Cont'd
Test established in Miller v. California: second prong: patently offensive material, **§ 14:24** —Cont'd
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**
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 explictives" as indecency, **§ 26:28**
Developments since Sable, **§ 26:25**
Limits on Pacifica: Sable ruling, **§ 26:24**

OBSCENITY—Cont'd
Indecency and, content regulation of broadcast and, **§ 26:17**—Cont'd
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 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**
Professional directories that sell advertising, **§ 20:31.40**
Sexually explicit material, restricting access to via government computers, **§ 27:23**
Social media posts by government employees, **§ 18:21.50**
Violence and, **§ 10:42**
The Portland "Nuremberg Files" Litigation, **§ 10:43**

ONLINE COMPUTER NETWORKS AND OBSCENITY
Obscene (and pornographic) speech: United States v. Thomas, **§§ 14:64, 14:65**

OPINION
Defamation and protection of (or "nonfact"), **§ 23:9**
Supreme Court's holding in Milkovich v. Lorain Journal, **§ 23:11**
Traditional fact/opinion 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**
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—Cont'd
Current doctrine, **§ 2:64**—Cont'd
Overview of First Amendment doctrine, **§ 2:65**
Reduced scrutiny based on setting, **§ 2:72**
Reduced scrutiny based on subject matter, **§ 2:69**
Right to receive information, **§ 2:73**
Strict scrutiny, **§ 2:67.50**
Underinclusive laws, **§ 2:67.50**
Democratic self-governance, **§ 2:26**
Alexander Meiklejohn's influence, **§ 2:28**
Free speech and democratic 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**
Permutations of heightened scrutiny, **§ 2:63**
Human dignity and self-fulfillment: freedom of speech as end in itself, **§ 2:21**
Link between expression and personality, **§ 2:22**
Classic libertarianism and harm principle, **§ 2:24**
Distinguishing free expression from other forms of self-gratification, **§ 2:23**
Expression and thought, **§ 2:25**
Marketplace theory, **§ 2:14**
Poetic power of marketplace metaphor, **§ 2:15**
Marketplace theory's analytic underpinnings, **§ 2:16**
Critiques of the theory, **§ 2:17**
Distinguishing process from the result, **§ 2:18**
Marketplace and value of open process, **§ 2:19**

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

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

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

PANDERING OR SOLICITING
Application of current obscenity standards: child pornography, **§ 14:52.70**

PARADES
As forums, **§ 8:33**

PARIS ADULT THEATRE I DECISION
Application of current obscenity standards to and significance of, **§ 14:39**

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

PARODY AND FAIR USE
Tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment: free speech safety valve in, **§ 21:12**

PARTICIPANTS
Gag orders on, in litigation, see Prior Restraint

PARTICIPATION FUNCTION
Free speech contribution to democratic, **§ 2:33**

PARTIES
Regulation of, see Elections

PATENTLY OFFENSIVE MATERIAL
Obscenity and, see Miller test

PATRONAGE CASES
Political speech and government employees and, see Government Employees

PEDESTRIAN MALLS
As forums, **§ 8:18.20**
Fairgrounds, **§ 8:18.30**

PENALTY-ENHANCEMENT STATUTE
Summary of First Amendment doctrines applicable to hate speech: Mitchell decision, **§ 12:26**

PENTAGON PAPERS LITIGATION
Decision in, contemporary history of prior restraint, **§ 15:5**
Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press: prior restraints and, **§ 25:40**
National security and, **§ 15:13**
Absolutist opinions of Justices Black and Douglas, **§ 15:17**
Dissenting opinions, **§ 15:20**
Factual background, **§ 15:14**
Justice Brennan's presumptive invalidity approach, **§ 15:18**
Opinions of Justices White, Stewart, and Marshall: significance of congressional authorization

PENTAGON PAPERS LITIGATION —Cont'd
National security and, **§ 15:13** —Cont'd
of prior restraints, **§ 15:19**
Separate opinions, **§ 15:16**
Supreme Court's per curiam holding, **§ 15:15**

PERFECT 10, INC. DECISION
Intellectual property and Internet, **§ 21:14**

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

PERSONALITY
Link between expression and, **§ 2:22**
Classic libertarianism and harm principle, **§ 2:24**
Distinguishing free expression from other forms of self-gratification, **§ 2:23**
Expression and thought, **§ 2:25**

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

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

PETITION
Government employees, **§ 18:24**
Political process
Disclosures of petition signatures, **§ 16:38.50**
Restrictions on petition circulators, **§ 16:38**
Reinforcing power of right of, **§ 16:3**

PHARMACEUTICAL ADVERTISING
Commercial speech in context of professional services
Off-label drug promotion and marketing, **§ 20:32.60**

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

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

PHYSICAL HARM
Heightened scrutiny and, **§ 4:16**

PHYSICAL OBSTRUCTION
In abortion protest, see Abortion protest

PICKERING DECISION
Disciplining government employees for speech activity: Pickering, Connick, and Waters cases, **§§ 18:6, 18:20.60**
Evolution of public concern/disruption test: Pickering and Connick, **§ 18:7**

PICKETING
Limits on picketing at cemeteries and funerals, **§ 5:11.50**
Privacy in the home and unwanted speech near the home, **§ 5:11**
Restraints directed to picketing, marching or other forms of symbolic expression, **§ 15:53**
Limits on picketing and public demonstrations, **§ 15:54**
Picketing of abortion clinics: Madsen decision, **§ 15:55**

PICO DECISION
School libraries, **§ 17:6**

PLACES
Applicable standard to content-neutral regulation of public forum, see Time, Place or Manner Standard
Historically dedicated to free expression, **§ 8:4**

PLANNED PARENTHOOD LITIGATION
Threats in context of political rhetoric, **§ 13:41.50**

PLAYBOY ENTERTAINMENT GROUP DECISION
Content-based regulation of cable television, **§ 27:14**

POLICE ACTIVITY
Public forum doctrines, **§ 8:53**

POLICY
Disciplining government employees for speech activity
Defining speech public concern: speech critical of office policy implicating questions of public accountability, **§ 18:12**
When speech is disruptive (applying balancing test), **§ 18:20**
Government as financier and, see Financier
Issues of, application of commercial speech doctrines and corporate speech on, **§ 20:17**
Policy paradox: tensions between intellectual property and First Amendment and philosophical and, **§ 21:2**

POLITICAL ACTIVITY
See also Elections; and entries beginning with term: Political
Banning, of some government employees, **§ 18:4**

POLITICAL AFFILIATION
Judicial officers, **§ 16:7.20**

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS
Advertising disclosure laws, **§ 16:39**
Candidate's right to spend own money, "Millionaires Amendment" decision, **§ 16:21**
Content regulation of broadcasts of, **§ 26:11**
Equal opportunities for access, **§ 26:13**
Equal opportunities for access: absolute protection against

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

POLITICAL FINANCING—Cont'd
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**
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 PARTIES
Restrictions
Violate First Amendment, **§ 16:14.10**

POLITICAL PATRONAGE CASES
Government employees, **§ 18:2**

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

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

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

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

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

POLLACK DECISION
Captive audience on government property, **§ 5:13**
Reconciling Pollack and Lehman:

POLLACK DECISION—Cont'd
Captive audience on government property, **§ 5:13**—Cont'd
making sense of captive audience principle, **§ 5:15**

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

POP-UPS
Internet advertising, **§ 27:26**

PORNOGRAPHIC SPEECH
Obscene and, see Obscene Speech

POSADAS DE PUERTO RICO DECISION
Government using speech regulation to discourage casino gambling and, **§ 20:20**
Repudiation of Posadas: holding in 44 Liquormart, **§ 20:25**

POWER ABUSE
Free speech contribution to checking value and control of, **§ 2:31**

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

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

PREEMPTION
Intellectual property, Internet and copyright preemption, **§ 21:15**

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

PRESS-ENTERPRISE I AND II DECISION
Press access to criminal judicial proceedings: developments after Richmond Newspapers decision, **§§ 25:6, 25:7**

PRESUMPTIVE INVALIDITY APPROACH
Pentagon Papers litigation and, by Justice Brennan, **§ 15:18**

PRIMARIES
Regulation of, see Elections

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

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

PRIOR RESTRAINT
Application of current obscenity standards: prior restraints in obscenity cases, **§ 14:56**
Forfeitures under RICO provisions: the Alexander decision, **§ 14:61**
Freedman v. Maryland requirements, **§ 14:58**
Other procedural safeguards: licensing procedures, **§ 14:59**
Other procedural safeguards: seizures of allegedly obscene material, **§ 14:60**
Prior restraints and nuisance statutes, **§ 14:62**
Requirement of immediate judicial review, **§ 14:57**
Use of informal pressure to censor adult material, **§ 14:63**
Commercial speech cases, in, **§ 15:62**
Defamation, Tory v. Cochran Supreme Court decision, **§ 15:57.50**
Door-to-door canvassing, **§ 15:54.50**
Emerging principle of unauthorized disclosure of truthful information by the press: Pentagon Papers decision, **§ 25:40**
First Amendment principles governing regulation of hate speech: racist demonstrations and prior restraints: Skokie case, **§ 12:27**
Freedman v. Maryland requirements, see Freedman v. Maryland
History of, **§ 15:1**
Overview of current doctrines, **§ 15:7**

PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd
History of, **§ 15:1**—Cont'd
Prior restraints, English common law, and First Amendment, **§ 15:2**
History of: contemporary history, **§ 15:3**
Nebraska Press decision, **§ 15:6**
Pentagon papers decision, **§ 15:5**
Supreme Court decision in Near v. Minnesota, **§ 15:4**
Judicial proceedings and, **§ 15:27**
Fair trials and free press, **§ 15:28**
Nebraska Press standard, **§ 15:29**
Judicial proceedings and application of Nebraska Press standard, **§ 15:30**
Judicial proceedings and application of Nebraska Press standard: Noriega tapes litigation, **§ 15:37**
Critique of Noriega decision, **§ 15:39**
Facts about the tapes and disputes, **§ 15:38**
Sequels to Noriega: restraints on disclosure of attorney/client conversations, **§ 15:40**
Judicial proceedings and application of Nebraska Press standard: presumption against gag order, **§ 15:31**
Indirect burdens of press coverage, **§ 15:34**
Influence of concurring opinions, **§ 15:32**
Juvenile proceedings and cases affecting privacy of children, **§ 15:33**
Protecting identity of jurors, **§ 15:36**
Restraints on information about judicial proceedings gathered through independent sources, **§ 15:35**
Judicial proceedings and gag orders on participants in litigation, **§ 15:41**
Attorneys, **§ 15:45**
Attorneys: lower court decisions on attorney gag orders, **§ 15:47**

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

PRIOR RESTRAINT—Cont'd
National security and: other decisions in national security cases, **§ 15:22**—Cont'd
Preclearance procedures for government employees, **§ 15:24**
Preclearance procedures for government employees: lower court decisions, **§ 15:26**
Preclearance procedures for government employees: Snepp decision, **§ 15:25**
Restrictions on distribution of material on military bases, **§ 15:23**
National security and: Pentagon papers, **§ 15:13**
Absolutist opinions of Justices Black and Douglas, **§ 15:17**
Dissenting opinions, **§ 15:20**
Factual background, **§ 15:14**
Justice Brennan's presumptive invalidity approach, **§ 15:18**
Opinions of Justices White, Stewart, and Marshall: significance of congressional authorization of prior restraints, **§ 15:19**
Separate opinions, **§ 15:16**
Supreme Court's per curiam holding, **§ 15:15**
"National security letters," nondisclosure 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**

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

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

PRISONS AND PRISONERS
''Captive audience,'' prison regulations, **§ 5:16**
Obscene (and pornographic) speech, restricting sexual materials in prisons, **§ 14:42.50**
Press access outside judicial proceedings, prison visitation cases, **§ 25:14**

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

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

PRIVATE CLUBS
Publications and theatrical presentations, **§ 17:14**
Public forum doctrines, **§ 8:23**

PRIVATE FIGURES/PUBLIC FIGURES
Defamation and, **§ 23:4**

PRIVATE POSSESSION OF OBSCENE MATERIAL
Application of current obscenity standards to, Stanley V. Georgia
Facts and holding, **§ 14:45**

PRIVATE POSSESSION OF OBSCENE MATERIAL —Cont'd
Application of current obscenity standards to, Stanley V. Georgia —Cont'd
Home, privacy of, **§ 14:46**
Information, right to receive, below
Information, right to receive
Generally, **§ 14:47**
Limitations on right to receive, **§ 14:49**
Recognition of right to receive, **§ 14:48**

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

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

PROFESSIONALISM CONCEPT
Government as librarian, curator, and arts impresario and, **§ 19:16**

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
See Commercial Speech

PROGRESSIVE DECISION
Prior restraint for reasons of national security and, **§ 15:21**

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

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

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**

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC FORUM LAW
See Public Forum Doctrines
Hate speech on campus and, see Hate Speech

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

PUBLIC INDECENCY
Overview, **§ 14:2**

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

PUBLICITY, RIGHT OF
First Amendment and privacy, **§ 24:4**

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

PUBLIC MATCHING FUNDS —Cont'd
Restricting contributions, candidates who accept public funds, **§ 16:21.60**

PUBLIC OFFICIAL
Defamation, public official defined, **§ 23:3.75**

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

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION
As forum, **§ 8:26**

PUBLIC VULGARITY
Application of current obscenity standards to: attempts to restrict

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

PUBLISHER
Government as, see Government

PUNISHMENT
Distinguishing between prior restraints and subsequent, **§ 15:9**

QUESTIONS OF LAW OR FACT
Government employees, **§ 18:26**

QUID PRO QUO HARASSMENT
Employment discrimination and, **§ 13:7**

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

RACIAL HARASSMENT
Academic freedom, **§ 17:38.50**

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

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

RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT (RICO)
Prior restraints in obscenity cases: application of current obscenity standards, forfeitures under RICO provisions in the Alexander decision, **§ 14:61**

RAILWAY EXPRESS AGENCY v. NEW YORK
Evolution of commercial speech doctrine in, **§ 20:3**

RANDALL V. SORRELL
Vermont's political contribution limits struck down by court in, **§ 16:14.60**

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**
Relationship of emotion principle to court's discussion of viewpoint discrimination, **§ 12:20**
Secondary effects not to be based on, **§ 9:22**

R.A.V. v. CITY OF ST. PAUL —Cont'd
Viewpoint, see Viewpoint Discrimination
Virginia v. Black , cross-burning, reinterpretation of R.A.V. case, **§ 12:21.50**

REACTIVE HARMS
Heightened scrutiny and, **§ 4:18**

"RECEIVE" INFORMATION, RIGHT TO
Current free speech doctrine, overview, **§ 2:73**
Obscenity, See Stanley v. Georgia

RECORDINGS
Public forum doctrines, police 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

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

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

REFUGE
Home as, captive audience and, **§ 5:5**

REGAN v. TAXATION WITH REPRESENTATION
Government as speech financier: policy and doctrinal tensions, proportionality principle in, **§ 19:12**

REGISTRATION
Government as speaker: philosophical issues posed, **§ 19:2.60**

RELATIONSHIP HARMS
Heightened scrutiny and, **§ 4:17**

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

RELIGIOUS SPEECH AND SYMBOLS
Education, **§ 17:40**
Government employees, see Government Employees

REMEDIES
For violation of Federal Access Act, **§ 13:30**

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

REPUBLICAN PARTY v. WHITE
Judicial candidates, limiting speech of, **§ 16:32.50**

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

RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS
Unwanted speech near the home: picketing and other expressions in, **§ 5:11**

"RESIGN TO RUN" LAWS
Regulation of speech of candidates: incumbents and, **§ 16:35**

RESTRICTIONS
Political parties' coordinated expenditures
Violate First Amendment, **§ 16:14.10**

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

REVENGE PORN
Application of current obscenity standards to, **§ 14:49.50**

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

RICO (RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT)
Prior restrains in obscenity cases: application of current obscenity 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**

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**

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 afixing 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 afixing 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**

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**

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 doctrine: 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: intermediate 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 standards: child pornography, **§ 14:52.70**

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**
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 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**

VULGARITY—Cont'd
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**

ZONING LAWS
Use of, to regulate nonobscene adult entertainment, **§ 14:39**