
CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------|
| <i>Preface</i> | xix |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | xxi |
| <i>Editorial Notice</i> | xxiii |
| <i>The First Amendment</i> | xxv |
| <i>The Constitution of the United States</i> | xxvii |
| <i>Biographical Notes on Selected U.S. Supreme Court Justices</i> | xli |
| <i>First Amendment Timeline</i> | lxi |

PART I

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION 1

CHAPTER I

| | |
|--|----|
| The History and Philosophy of Free Expression | 3 |
| Note: The History of Free Expression | 3 |
| Note: The Philosophy of Free Expression | 7 |
| Note: Organization | 13 |

CHAPTER II

Content-Based Restrictions: Dangerous Ideas and Information 15

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Speech that “Causes” Unlawful Conduct | 15 |
| <i>Shaffer v. United States</i> | 16 |
| <i>Masses Publishing Co. v. Patten</i> | 17 |
| <i>Schenck v. United States</i> | 19 |
| Note: <i>Shaffer</i> , <i>Masses</i> , and <i>Schenck</i> | 20 |
| <i>Frohwerk v. United States</i> | 22 |
| <i>Debs v. United States</i> | 23 |
| <i>Abrams v. United States</i> | 24 |
| Note: <i>Abrams</i> and the Emergence of the Holmes/Brandeis Tradition | 27 |
| <i>Gitlow v. New York</i> | 28 |
| Note: “Abstract Doctrine” versus “Urging to Action” | 31 |
| <i>Whitney v. California</i> | 31 |
| Note: The Brandeis Concurrence and the Road to <i>Dennis</i> | 34 |
| <i>Dennis v. United States</i> | 36 |
| Note: <i>Dennis</i> and the Communist “Conspiracy” | 40 |
| Note: The Road to <i>Brandenburg</i> | 42 |
| <i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i> | 44 |
| Note: The <i>Brandenburg</i> Formulation | 46 |
| Note: Abridgment of Speech Other Than by Direct Criminal Prohibition | 50 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| B. Speech that Provokes a Hostile Audience Reaction | 55 |
| <i>Terminiello v. Chicago</i> | 55 |
| <i>Cantwell v. Connecticut</i> | 56 |
| <i>Feiner v. New York</i> | 57 |
| Note: The Search for Mechanisms of Control | 59 |
| <i>Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire</i> | 63 |
| Note: Fighting Words | 64 |
| Note: The <i>Skokie</i> Controversy | 66 |
| <i>Snyder v. Phelps</i> | 68 |
| C. Classified Information | 70 |
| <i>New York Times Co. v. United States; United States v. Washington Post Co.</i> | 70 |
| Note: The Pentagon Papers Controversy | 75 |
| Note: Dangerous Ideas and Information—Final Thoughts | 79 |
| | |
| CHAPTER III | |
| Overbreadth, Vagueness, and Prior Restraint | 81 |
| A. Overbreadth and Vagueness | 81 |
| <i>Gooding v. Wilson</i> | 81 |
| Note: Overbreadth | 83 |
| Note: Vagueness | 86 |
| B. Prior Restraint | 87 |
| <i>Lovell v. Griffin</i> | 88 |
| Note: Licensing as Prior Restraint | 88 |
| <i>Near v. Minnesota</i> | 91 |
| Note: Injunction as Prior Restraint | 92 |
| | |
| CHAPTER IV | |
| Content-Based Restrictions: “Low” Value Speech | 95 |
| A. False Statements of Fact | 96 |
| <i>New York Times v. Sullivan</i> | 96 |
| Note: “The Central Meaning” of <i>New York Times v. Sullivan</i> | 101 |
| <i>Curtis Publishing Co. v. Butts; Associated Press v. Walker</i> | 103 |
| <i>Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.</i> | 104 |
| Note: Public and Private Figures, Public and Private Speech | 106 |
| <i>Dun & Bradstreet v. Greenmoss Builders</i> | 107 |
| Note: Other False Statements of Fact | 108 |
| <i>United States v. Alvarez</i> | 109 |
| <i>Hustler Magazine v. Falwell</i> | 111 |
| B. “Nonnewsworthy” Disclosures of “Private” Information | 113 |
| <i>Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn</i> | 113 |
| Note: Invasion of Privacy and the First Amendment | 115 |
| C. Threats | 118 |
| <i>Bridges v. California</i> | 118 |
| <i>Watts v. United States</i> | 119 |
| <i>Planned Parenthood v. American Coalition of Life Activists</i> | 119 |
| <i>Counterman v. Colorado</i> | 121 |
| D. Commercial Advertising | 124 |
| <i>Virginia State Board of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council</i> | 124 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Note: <i>Virginia Pharmacy</i> and “the Free Flow of Commercial Information” | 129 |
| Note: Truthful, Nondeceptive Commercial Advertising after <i>Virginia Pharmacy</i> | 131 |
| <i>Central Hudson Gas v. Public Service Commission of New York</i> | 132 |
| Note: Truthful, Nondeceptive Commercial Advertising | 133 |
| Note: Other Regulations of Commercial Advertising | 136 |
| E. Obscenity | 140 |
| <i>Roth v. United States; Alberts v. California</i> | 140 |
| Note: Obscenity and Free Expression | 141 |
| Note: Developments in the Law of “Obscenity” — 1957–1973 | 145 |
| <i>Miller v. California</i> | 148 |
| <i>Paris Adult Theatre I v. Slaton</i> | 150 |
| Note: The 1973 Reformulation and Its Aftermath | 153 |
| F. Child Pornography, Animal Cruelty, and Violent Expression | 156 |
| <i>New York v. Ferber</i> | 156 |
| <i>Ashcroft v. The Free Speech Coalition</i> | 158 |
| Note: Child Pornography | 160 |
| <i>United States v. Stevens</i> | 161 |
| <i>Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Ass’n</i> | 163 |
| G. The Lewd, the Profane, and the Indecent | 166 |
| <i>Cohen v. California</i> | 166 |
| Note: Profanity, <i>Cohen</i> , and the Captive Audience | 169 |
| <i>Erznoznik v. Jacksonville</i> | 171 |
| <i>FCC v. Pacifica Foundation</i> | 172 |
| Note: Fleeting Expletives | 174 |
| <i>Iancu v. Brunetti</i> | 174 |
| <i>Sable Communications, Inc. v. FCC</i> | 176 |
| <i>Reno v. American Civil Liberties Union</i> | 176 |
| <i>Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union</i> | 177 |
| Note: “Indecent” Expression | 178 |
| Note: Zoning Theaters with Adult Movies and Bars with Nude Dancing | 181 |
| H. Hate Speech | 184 |
| <i>Beauharnais v. Illinois</i> | 184 |
| Note: Group Defamation and “Hate Speech” | 186 |
| <i>R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul</i> | 190 |
| <i>Wisconsin v. Mitchell</i> | 193 |
| Note: <i>R.A.V.</i> and <i>Mitchell</i> | 194 |
| <i>Virginia v. Black</i> | 196 |
| Note: <i>R.A.V.</i> and <i>Black</i> | 202 |
| Note: Pornography and the Victimization of Women | 203 |
| Note: “Low” Value Speech—Final Thoughts | 205 |

CHAPTER V

Content-Neutral Restrictions: Limitations on the Means of Communication and the Problem of Content-Neutrality 209

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| A. General Principles | 209 |
| <i>Schneider v. State</i> | 209 |
| <i>Martin v. City of Struthers</i> | 210 |
| <i>Kovacs v. Cooper</i> | 211 |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| | <i>Metromedia, Inc. v. San Diego</i> | 212 |
| | <i>City of Ladue v. Gilleo</i> | 213 |
| | <i>Barnicki v. Vopper</i> | 214 |
| | Note: The Search for Principles | 215 |
| | Note: The Meaning of “Content-Neutrality” | 216 |
| B. | Speech on Public Property: The Public Forum | 218 |
| 1. | The Public Forum: Streets and Parks | 219 |
| | <i>Commonwealth v. Davis</i> | 219 |
| | <i>Hague v. CIO</i> | 219 |
| | <i>Schneider v. State</i> | 220 |
| | Note: Regulating the Public Forum | 221 |
| | Note: Devices for Regulating the Public Forum | 225 |
| 2. | The Public Forum: Other Publicly Owned Property | 227 |
| | <i>Adderley v. Florida</i> | 227 |
| | Note: “No Less Than a Private Owner of Property”? | 229 |
| | <i>International Society for Krishna Consciousness v. Lee</i> | 231 |
| | Note: Modern Public Forum Doctrine | 233 |
| | Note: The Right to a “Private” Forum | 234 |
| 3. | The Public Forum: Unequal Access and the Problem of Content-Neutrality | 235 |
| | <i>Police Department of Chicago v. Mosley</i> | 236 |
| | Note: <i>Mosley</i> and the “Equality” of Ideas | 237 |
| | <i>Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights</i> | 239 |
| | Note: <i>Lehman</i> and the Limits of <i>Mosley</i> | 242 |
| | <i>Perry Educators’ Association v. Perry Local Educators’ Association</i> | 244 |
| | Note: Quintessential, Designated, and Nonpublic Forums | 246 |
| | Note: Religious Expression and the Meaning of “Viewpoint Neutrality” | 249 |
| | <i>Christian Legal Society Chapter v. Martinez</i> | 251 |
| 4. | The End of the Distinction Between Subject-Matter and Viewpoint-Based Restrictions? | 254 |
| | <i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i> | 254 |
| 5. | Unequal Access and the Problem of Government Speech | 256 |
| | <i>Southeastern Promotions v. Conrad</i> | 257 |
| | <i>Board of Education, Island Trees Union Free School District v. Pico</i> | 258 |
| | <i>Regan v. Taxation with Representation of Washington</i> | 261 |
| | <i>National Endowment for the Arts v. Finley</i> | 262 |
| | <i>Rust v. Sullivan</i> | 264 |
| | Note: The Implications of <i>Rust</i> | 266 |
| | <i>Legal Services Corporation v. Velazquez</i> | 267 |
| | <i>Agency for International Development v. Alliance for Open Society International</i> | 269 |
| | Note: The Reach of Government Speech: Sumnum, Walker, Matal, and Shurtleff | 271 |
| C. | Symbolic Conduct | 276 |
| | <i>United States v. O’Brien</i> | 277 |
| | Note: Draft Card Burning and the First Amendment | 281 |
| | Note: Flag Desecration and Misuse | 285 |
| | <i>Barnes v. Glen Theatre, Inc.</i> | 290 |
| | Note: Other Forms of Symbolic Speech | 292 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| D. Other Means of Expression: Litigation, Association, and the Right Not to Speak | 293 |
| <i>NAACP v. Button</i> | 293 |
| Note: Litigation and the First Amendment | 294 |
| <i>NAACP v. Alabama</i> | 295 |
| <i>Roberts v. U.S. Jaycees</i> | 296 |
| Note: Association and the First Amendment | 297 |
| <i>Boy Scouts of America v. Dale</i> | 298 |
| Note: The Meaning of <i>Dale</i> | 300 |
| <i>Pruneyard Shopping Center v. Robins</i> | 301 |
| Note: Compelled Affirmation, Expression, and Association: The Right Not to Speak | 301 |
| E. Regulation of Political Solicitation, Contribution, Expenditure, and Activity | 309 |
| <i>Buckley v. Valeo</i> | 309 |
| Note: <i>Buckley</i> and the Problem of Abridging Speech to “Enhance” the Electoral Process | 316 |
| Note: Subsidy and Disclosure | 318 |
| Note: Campaign Finance Regulation in the Thirty Years After <i>Buckley</i> | 321 |
| <i>McCormell v. Federal Election Comm’n</i> | 323 |
| Note: Campaign Finance and the Roberts Court | 326 |
| <i>Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission</i> | 329 |
| Note: Reflections on <i>Citizens United</i> | 338 |
| <i>McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission</i> | 341 |
| <i>Federal Elections Commission v. Ted Cruz for Senate</i> | 344 |
| Note: Additional Regulation of the Electoral Process | 348 |
| Note: Regulating the Political Activities of Public Employees | 350 |
| Note: Content-Neutral Restrictions—Final Thoughts | 353 |
| | |
| CHAPTER VI | |
| Freedom of the Press | 355 |
| A. A “Preferred” Status for the Press? | 355 |
| B. A Right to “Gather” News? | 356 |
| <i>Branzburg v. Hayes</i> | 356 |
| Note: A Right to Gather News? | 360 |
| Note: A Press Right of Access to Information? | 362 |
| <i>Richmond Newspapers v. Virginia</i> | 363 |
| <i>Globe Newspaper Co. v. Superior Court</i> | 364 |
| Note: Variations on the Press Right of Access | 365 |
| C. Differential Treatment of the Press | 366 |
| <i>Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. v. Minnesota Commissioner of Revenue</i> | 366 |
| Note: Differential Treatment | 367 |
| D. Regulating the Press to “Improve” the Marketplace of Ideas | 369 |
| <i>Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC</i> | 369 |
| Note: Regulating the Airwaves | 371 |
| <i>Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo</i> | 373 |
| <i>Turner Broadcasting System Inc. v. FCC</i> | 374 |
| Note: <i>Turner</i> and the Regulation of Cable | 376 |
| Note: The First Amendment in Cyberspace | 377 |
| Note: Free Expression—Final Thoughts | 383 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| PART II | |
| THE CONSTITUTION AND RELIGION | 387 |
| <hr/> | |
| CHAPTER VII | |
| Historical and Analytical Overview | 389 |
| <i>Everson v. Board of Education</i> | 389 |
| Note: The History of the Religion Clauses | 391 |
| Note: General Approaches to the Religion Clauses | 397 |
| Note: Defining Religion | 402 |
| CHAPTER VIII | |
| The Establishment Clause | 407 |
| A. The Anticoercion Principle | 408 |
| <i>Lee v. Weisman</i> | 408 |
| Note: The Anticoercion Principle | 415 |
| B. The Nonendorsement Principle, History's Relevance, and de Facto Establishments | 418 |
| Introductory Note: Formulating the Nonendorsement Principle | 418 |
| <i>American Legion v. American Humanist Association</i> | 421 |
| Note: Abandoning the <i>Lemon</i> Test and Replacing It with What? | 429 |
| C. Impermissible Purposes | 432 |
| Note: Problems with a Purpose Test | 432 |
| D. Facially Neutral Statutes that Incidentally Aid Religion: Permissible and Impermissible Effects | 439 |
| Note: The Problem and Its Background | 439 |
| <i>Mueller v. Allen</i> | 441 |
| Note: From <i>Aguilar</i> to <i>Mitchell</i> | 444 |
| <i>Zelman v. Simmons-Harris</i> | 448 |
| Note: Purpose and Effect in Aid to Nonpublic Education—Benevolent Neutrality? | 450 |
| Note: Concluding Observations | 456 |
| CHAPTER IX | |
| The Free Exercise Clause: Required Accommodations | 459 |
| Note: From <i>Reynolds</i> to <i>Smith</i> | 459 |
| <i>Braunfeld v. Brown</i> | 460 |
| <i>Sherbert v. Verner</i> | 460 |
| <i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i> | 461 |
| Note: Problems of Mandatory Accommodation | 462 |
| <i>Employment Division, Department of Human Resources v. Smith</i> | 465 |
| Note: Should Accommodation Be Required? | 472 |
| CHAPTER X | |
| Permissible Accommodation | 479 |
| <i>Corporation of Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. Amos</i> | 480 |
| <i>Texas Monthly v. Bullock</i> | 483 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Board of Education of Kiryas Joel Village School District v. Grumet</i> | 484 |
| Note: When — If Ever — Should Accommodations of Religion Be Permitted? | 486 |
| <i>Masterpiece Cakeshop Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Comm’n</i> | 488 |
| Note: The Implications of <i>Masterpiece Cakeshop</i> | 489 |
| <i>Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & School v. EEOC</i> | 492 |
| Note: The Relation Between the Religion Clauses and Other Protections of Expression | 493 |
| Note: Concluding Observations | 497 |
| <i>Table of Cases</i> | 499 |
| <i>Table of Authorities</i> | 511 |
| <i>Index</i> | 523 |

