

# First Amendment Law



# First Amendment Law

---

## Freedom of Expression and Freedom of Religion

FOURTH EDITION

**Arthur D. Hellman**

SALLY ANN SEMENKO ENDOWED CHAIR  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH SCHOOL OF LAW

**William D. Araiza**

PROFESSOR OF LAW  
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL

**Thomas E. Baker**

PROFESSOR OF LAW  
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LAW

**Ashutosh A. Bhagwat**

MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. PROFESSOR OF LAW  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS  
SCHOOL OF LAW



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS  
Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2018  
Carolina Academic Press, LLC  
All Rights Reserved

LCCN: 2018933299  
ISBN: 978-1-5310-0940-3  
eISBN: 978-1-53100-941-0

Carolina Academic Press, LLC  
700 Kent Street  
Durham, North Carolina 27701  
Telephone (919) 489-7486  
Fax (919) 493-5668  
[www.cap-press.com](http://www.cap-press.com)

Printed in the United States of America

To Bonnie, Jerry, Roberta and Walter, ADH

To Stephen, WDA

To Jane Marie, TEB

To Shannon, Uma and Declan, AAB



# Contents

---

|                               |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Table of Cases                | xix    |
| Preface to the Fourth Edition | xxix   |
| Preface to the First Edition  | xxxiii |
| Acknowledgments               | xxxvii |

## PART ONE FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Chapter 1 • The Problem of Subversive Advocacy                    | 3  |
| A. First Encounters                                               | 3  |
| <i>Schenck v. United States</i>                                   | 3  |
| Note: <i>Schenck</i> and Its Antecedents                          | 5  |
| Note: The “Unrevised Holmes” and <i>Baltzer v. United States</i>  | 7  |
| <i>Frohwerk v. United States</i>                                  | 8  |
| <i>Debs v. United States</i>                                      | 9  |
| Note: <i>Frohwerk</i> and <i>Debs</i>                             | 11 |
| B. The <i>Abrams</i> Case and the Holmes Dissent                  | 12 |
| <i>Abrams v. United States</i>                                    | 12 |
| Note: The <i>Abrams</i> Dissent and Seditious Libel               | 15 |
| C. Learned Hand and the <i>Masses</i> Case                        | 16 |
| <i>Masses Publishing Co. v. Patten</i>                            | 16 |
| Note: The Opinion in <i>Masses</i>                                | 20 |
| Problem: Protesting a U.S. Military Action                        | 21 |
| D. <i>Gitlow</i> , <i>Whitney</i> , and the Cases of the Thirties | 22 |
| <i>Gitlow v. New York</i>                                         | 22 |
| Note: <i>Gitlow</i> and <i>Lochner</i>                            | 26 |
| <i>Whitney v. California</i>                                      | 27 |
| Note: Why Protect Freedom of Speech?                              | 32 |
| Note: Organizational Advocacy and Individual Responsibility       | 33 |
| E. The Smith Act Prosecutions                                     | 36 |
| <i>Dennis v. United States</i>                                    | 36 |
| Note: <i>Dennis</i> and Revolutionary Speech                      | 45 |
| Note: <i>Yates</i> , <i>Scales</i> , and <i>Noto</i>              | 45 |
| Problem: “Warriors for Earth”                                     | 49 |
| F. <i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i> and Its Implications                | 50 |

|                                                                             |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| <i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i>                                                  | 50     |
| Note: <i>Brandenburg</i> and Its Antecedents                                | 53     |
| <i>Hess v. Indiana</i>                                                      | 53     |
| Note: The Summary Reversal in <i>Hess</i>                                   | 55     |
| <i>NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Company</i>                                  | 55     |
| Problem: Encouraging Participation in a “Jihad”                             | 58     |
| Problem: Advice to a Street Gang                                            | 59     |
| G. The “True Threat”                                                        | 60     |
| Note: <i>Watts, Black</i> , and the “True Threat”                           | 60     |
| Problem: Anti-Abortion Website                                              | 62     |
| H. A Last Word from Justice Holmes                                          | 63     |
| <i>United States v. Schwimmer</i>                                           | 63     |
| Note: “Freedom for the Thought that We Hate”                                | 65     |
| <br><b>Chapter 2 · Unprotected Speech: The <i>Chaplinsky</i> Exclusions</b> | <br>67 |
| A. “Fighting Words”                                                         | 67     |
| <i>Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire</i>                                          | 67     |
| Note: <i>Chaplinsky</i> and Its Implications                                | 69     |
| Note: “Fighting Words” Today                                                | 70     |
| Problems: The “Callahan Epithet” and Other Expletives                       | 71     |
| B. “The Libelous”—or Otherwise Tortious                                     | 75     |
| [1] The Constitutionalization of Defamation                                 | 76     |
| <i>New York Times Co. v. Sullivan</i>                                       | 76     |
| Note: The Holding of <i>New York Times</i>                                  | 85     |
| Note: Proving “Malice”                                                      | 87     |
| Note: “Public Officials” and “Official Conduct”                             | 89     |
| Note: Beyond “Public Officials”                                             | 91     |
| [2] “Public Figures” and Private Plaintiffs                                 | 93     |
| <i>Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.</i>                                          | 93     |
| Note: Who Is a “Public Figure”?                                             | 102    |
| Note: “Public Figures” in the Lower Courts                                  | 105    |
| Note: Suits by Private Plaintiffs                                           | 106    |
| Note: “Fact” and “Opinion”                                                  | 108    |
| [3] “Outrage” and Emotional Distress                                        | 110    |
| <i>Snyder v. Phelps</i>                                                     | 110    |
| Note: Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress and the                  |        |
| First Amendment                                                             | 119    |
| Problem: An Obsessive Blogger                                               | 121    |
| [4] Invasion of Privacy                                                     | 122    |
| Problem: A Wrestler and a Sex Tape                                          | 123    |
| C. “The Lewd and Obscene”                                                   | 124    |
| [1] Initial Development of the Law                                          | 124    |
| <i>Roth v. United States</i>                                                | 124    |
| <i>Alberts v. California</i>                                                | 124    |



|                                                                                       |         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Note: <i>Roth</i> and Its Antecedents                                                 | 132     |
| Note: “Ideas” and “Entertainment”                                                     | 132     |
| Note: “I Know It When I See It”?                                                      | 133     |
| <i>Stanley v. Georgia</i>                                                             | 134     |
| Note: The Implications of <i>Stanley</i>                                              | 137     |
| [2] Current Doctrine                                                                  | 138     |
| <i>Miller v. California</i>                                                           | 138     |
| <i>Paris Adult Theatre I v. Slaton</i>                                                | 142     |
| Note: The 1973 “Restatement”                                                          | 149     |
| Note: “Community Standards” and the Internet                                          | 151     |
| <br><b>Chapter 3 · New Candidates for Categorical Exclusion or Limited Protection</b> | <br>155 |
| A. Offensive Language and Images                                                      | 155     |
| <i>Cohen v. California</i>                                                            | 155     |
| Note: The Implications of <i>Cohen</i>                                                | 160     |
| <i>Rosenfeld v. New Jersey</i>                                                        | 160     |
| Note: “The Willful Use of Scurrilous Language”                                        | 162     |
| Note: Protecting the Unwilling Audience                                               | 163     |
| Problem: Foul Language in a Neighborhood Park                                         | 164     |
| Problem: The Cursing Canoeist                                                         | 164     |
| <i>FCC v. Pacifica Foundation</i>                                                     | 165     |
| Note: The Medium and the Message                                                      | 173     |
| Problem: The Over-Excited Actress                                                     | 174     |
| B. Child Pornography                                                                  | 175     |
| <i>New York v. Ferber</i>                                                             | 175     |
| Note: A New Category of Unprotected Speech                                            | 181     |
| Note: Private Possession of Child Pornography                                         | 182     |
| Problem: “Child Pornography” in a Journal                                             | 184     |
| <i>Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition</i>                                              | 185     |
| Note: “Virtual Child Pornography”                                                     | 194     |
| Note: <i>U.S. v. Williams</i> and “Purported” Child Pornography                       | 194     |
| C. Commercial Speech                                                                  | 197     |
| <i>Virginia State Board of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, Inc.</i>   | 197     |
| Note: First Amendment Protection for Commercial Speech                                | 204     |
| <i>Central Hudson Gas &amp; Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission</i>           | 205     |
| Note: Identifying Commercial Speech                                                   | 209     |
| Problem: “Commercial” Speech and Public Debate                                        | 211     |
| Note: <i>Discovery Network</i> and the “Reasonable Fit”                               | 212     |
| <i>Lorillard Tobacco Co. v. Reilly</i>                                                | 215     |
| Note: The Normalization of Commercial Speech                                          | 226     |
| Problem: Attacking Childhood Obesity                                                  | 227     |
| Note: <i>Sorrell</i> and the Continued Ferment over Commercial Speech                 | 228     |

|                                                               |         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Note: A Return to <i>Lochner</i> ?                            | 231     |
| D. The End of Categorical Balancing                           | 232     |
| <i>United States v. Stevens</i>                               | 232     |
| Note: The Implications of <i>Stevens</i>                      | 237     |
| <i>Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association</i>           | 238     |
| Note: Violence, Interactivity, and the Protection of Children | 248     |
| <i>United States v. Alvarez</i>                               | 249     |
| Note: Knowingly False Statements of Fact                      | 261     |
| Problem: The Stolen Valor Act of 2013                         | 263     |
| <br><b>Chapter 4 · Trans-Substantive Doctrines</b>            | <br>265 |
| A. Prior Restraints                                           | 265     |
| Note: An Introduction to Prior Restraints                     | 265     |
| [1] Licensing                                                 | 266     |
| <i>Lovell v. City of Griffin</i>                              | 266     |
| Note: Licensing Schemes and the <i>Freedman</i> Requirements  | 268     |
| [2] Injunctions and Other Remedies                            | 274     |
| <i>Near v. Minnesota</i>                                      | 274     |
| Note: The Decision in <i>Near</i>                             | 278     |
| Problem: A Recalcitrant Defamer                               | 280     |
| <i>New York Times Co. v. United States</i>                    |         |
| (The “Pentagon Papers” Case)                                  | 281     |
| Note: Injunctions Against Speech                              | 292     |
| Note: “The H-Bomb Secret”                                     | 292     |
| Problems: Disclosure of NSA Monitoring                        | 293     |
| B. Overbreadth and Vagueness                                  | 294     |
| <i>New York v. Ferber</i>                                     | 294     |
| <i>City of Houston v. Hill</i>                                | 297     |
| <i>Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition</i>                      | 301     |
| Note: The Overbreadth Doctrine                                | 301     |
| Note: The Vagueness Doctrine                                  | 302     |
| <br><b>Chapter 5 · Content-Based Regulation</b>               | <br>305 |
| A. The Principle                                              | 305     |
| <i>Police Department of Chicago v. Mosley</i>                 | 305     |
| Note: “Above All Else . . .”: The <i>Mosley</i> Principle     | 308     |
| Note: Speech Near Polling Places                              | 310     |
| B. Defining Content Discrimination                            | 312     |
| <i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i>                                | 312     |
| Note: A Narrower View of Content Neutrality?                  | 322     |
| Problem: Flags on Holidays                                    | 323     |
| Problem: A Panhandling Ordinance                              | 323     |
| C. Applying Strict Scrutiny                                   | 324     |
| <i>Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar</i>                          | 324     |

|                                                                                 |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Note: How Strict Is “Strict”?                                                   | 337 |
| Problem: Nondisclosure of National Security Letters                             | 339 |
| <b>Chapter 6 · Regulating the “Time, Place, and Manner” of Protected Speech</b> | 341 |
| A. Early Development of the Doctrine                                            | 341 |
| <i>Lovell v. City of Griffin</i>                                                | 341 |
| <i>Schneider v. New Jersey</i>                                                  | 342 |
| Note: From <i>Lovell</i> to <i>Schneider</i>                                    | 344 |
| <i>Martin v. City of Struthers</i>                                              | 344 |
| Note: Regulating the Manner of Expressive Activity                              | 348 |
| B. Applications of the Doctrine                                                 | 350 |
| <i>Frisby v. Schultz</i>                                                        | 350 |
| <i>Ward v. Rock Against Racism</i>                                              | 356 |
| <i>City of Ladue v. Gilleo</i>                                                  | 360 |
| Note: Foreclosing Particular Modes of Expression                                | 365 |
| Note: Narrow Tailoring and “Underinclusiveness”                                 | 366 |
| Problem: Regulating Newsracks                                                   | 367 |
| <i>McCullen v. Coakley</i>                                                      | 368 |
| Note: Restrictions on Anti-Abortion Speech                                      | 384 |
| Problem: Buffer or Bubble?                                                      | 386 |
| Problem: Picketing of Religious Activities                                      | 386 |
| <b>Chapter 7 · Expressive Conduct and Secondary Effects</b>                     | 389 |
| A. Expressive Conduct                                                           | 389 |
| <i>United States v. O’Brien</i>                                                 | 389 |
| Note: “Symbolic Speech” and the <i>Tinker</i> Case                              | 395 |
| Note: “Incidental” Burdens on Expression                                        | 395 |
| <i>Texas v. Johnson</i>                                                         | 397 |
| Note: Flag Burning as Protected Speech                                          | 406 |
| Problem: A New Flag Protection Act                                              | 406 |
| B. “Secondary Effects” as a Basis for Regulation                                | 407 |
| <i>City of Renton v. Playtime Theatres, Inc.</i>                                | 407 |
| Note: Origins of the “Secondary Effects” Doctrine                               | 412 |
| <i>Boos v. Barry</i>                                                            | 413 |
| <i>City of Los Angeles v. Alameda Books, Inc.</i>                               | 417 |
| Note: Continuing Controversy over “Secondary Effects”                           | 427 |
| Problem: Limiting the Hours of Adult Businesses                                 | 428 |
| C. Expression and Conduct: Untangling the Doctrines                             | 429 |
| <i>City of Erie v. Pap’s A.M.</i>                                               | 430 |
| Note: Expressive Conduct, Secondary Effects, and Incidental Burdens             | 440 |
| Problem: Nudity “for Entertainment Purposes”                                    | 442 |
| Problem: An “Affirmative Action Bake Sale”                                      | 443 |

|                                                                                |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Chapter 8 · Speech on Government Property and the Public Forum Doctrine</b> | 445     |
| A. Foundations of the Doctrine                                                 | 445     |
| <i>Hague v. Committee for Industrial Organization</i>                          | 445     |
| <i>Schneider v. New Jersey</i>                                                 | 447     |
| <i>Cantwell v. Connecticut</i>                                                 | 447     |
| Note: The Significance of <i>Cantwell</i>                                      | 449     |
| <i>Cox v. New Hampshire</i>                                                    | 449     |
| Note: The Law Established by the Foundational Cases                            | 452     |
| B. Mass Demonstrations and the Problem of the “Hostile Audience”               | 453     |
| <i>Terminiello v. Chicago</i>                                                  | 453     |
| Note: Hostile Audiences and Provocative Speakers                               | 457     |
| <i>Forsyth County v. Nationalist Movement</i>                                  | 460     |
| Note: Fees and Permits for Demonstrations on Public Property                   | 465     |
| Problem: Klan Rally and Counter-Rally                                          | 466     |
| C. Access to Nontraditional Forums and Facilities                              | 467     |
| Note: Competing Approaches to Speech on Public Property                        | 467     |
| <i>Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights</i>                                        | 470     |
| Note: <i>Lehman</i> and the <i>Perry</i> Synthesis                             | 474     |
| <i>Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.</i>             | 476     |
| <i>International Society for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee</i>            | 485     |
| <i>Lee v. International Society for Krishna Consciousness Inc.</i>             | 498     |
| Note: Competing Views of the Public Forum                                      | 499     |
| Note: <i>Rosenberger</i> and Viewpoint Discrimination                          | 500     |
| Note: “Limited” and “Designated” Forums                                        | 502     |
| Problem: Display of Controversial Art                                          | 503     |
| Problem: Flags and Banners on Highway Overpasses                               | 504     |
| D. Speech on Private Property                                                  | 505     |
| Note: The <i>Marsh</i> Decision                                                | 505     |
| Note: The Shopping Center Cases                                                | 506     |
| <br><b>Chapter 9 · Compelled Expression</b>                                    | <br>509 |
| A. Compelled Speech                                                            | 509     |
| <i>West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette</i>                      | 509     |
| Note: <i>Barnette</i> and Its Implications                                     | 517     |
| Problem: A State University Pledge                                             | 517     |
| <i>Wooley v. Maynard</i>                                                       | 518     |
| Note: The <i>Barnette</i> Principle                                            | 521     |
| Problem: Navajo Spiritualism on License Plates?                                | 523     |
| Note: “Trivializing” <i>Barnette</i> ?                                         | 523     |
| Problem: The Wedding Photographer and the Gay Couple                           | 524     |
| Note: Speech, Coercion, and Meaning                                            | 525     |
| B. Compelled Subsidy                                                           | 526     |

|                                                                                            |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <i>Abood v. Detroit Board of Education</i>                                                 | 526 |
| Note: Unease with <i>Abood</i>                                                             | 530 |
| Note: Applying <i>Abood</i> Beyond the Union Context                                       | 531 |
| Problem: Satirical Anti-Tobacco Advertising                                                | 535 |
| <b>Chapter 10 · Freedom of Association</b>                                                 | 537 |
| <i>NAACP v. Alabama</i>                                                                    | 537 |
| Note: <i>NAACP</i> and Beyond                                                              | 540 |
| <i>Roberts v. United States Jaycees</i>                                                    | 540 |
| Note: Competing Approaches to Freedom of Association                                       | 547 |
| Problem: The New Age Coalition and the Fundamentalists                                     | 548 |
| Note: <i>Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian</i><br><i>and Bisexual Group of Boston</i>  | 549 |
| <i>Boy Scouts of America v. Dale</i>                                                       | 550 |
| Note: <i>Dale</i> and the Precedents                                                       | 563 |
| Note: Status and Message                                                                   | 564 |
| Problem: Exclusion from a Gay Softball League                                              | 564 |
| <b>Chapter 11 · Campaign Finance</b>                                                       | 567 |
| A. Foundational Principles                                                                 | 567 |
| <i>Buckley v. Valeo</i>                                                                    | 567 |
| Note: <i>Buckley</i> and Its Progeny                                                       | 585 |
| B. Corporate and Union Political Speech                                                    | 586 |
| Note: Corporate and Union Speech, Electoral Integrity,<br>and the First Amendment          | 586 |
| <i>Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission</i>                                      | 590 |
| Problem: Corporate Contributions to an Independent Spender                                 | 605 |
| Problem: A State Response to <i>Citizens United</i> ?                                      | 606 |
| C. Disclosure Requirements                                                                 | 606 |
| Note: Disclosure Requirements and the First Amendment                                      | 606 |
| D. Circumvention of Contribution Limits and <i>Buckley</i> 's Limits                       | 610 |
| Note: The Anti-Circumvention Idea                                                          | 610 |
| Note: <i>McCutcheon</i> and the Limits of the Anti-Circumvention<br>Rationale              | 611 |
| <b>Chapter 12 · Beyond Regulation: The Government as Employer<br/>        and Educator</b> | 615 |
| A. First Amendment Rights of Government Employees                                          | 615 |
| <i>Connick v. Myers</i>                                                                    | 615 |
| Note: <i>Pickering</i> and Its Progeny                                                     | 623 |
| Problem: An Activist Clerk                                                                 | 624 |
| <i>Garcetti v. Ceballos</i>                                                                | 625 |
| Note: The Implications of <i>Garcetti</i>                                                  | 637 |

|                                                                     |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Problem: The Outspoken University Administrator                     | 638 |
| Note: Testimony as Part of an Employee's "Ordinary"                 |     |
| Work Responsibilities                                               | 638 |
| Problem: The Police Chief Versus the Mayor                          | 639 |
| Note: Patronage Dismissals                                          | 640 |
| B. The First Amendment in the Public Schools                        | 641 |
| <i>Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District</i>             | 641 |
| Note: The Implications of <i>Tinker</i>                             | 646 |
| Note: From <i>Tinker</i> to the "Bong Hits" Case                    | 646 |
| <i>Morse v. Frederick</i>                                           | 650 |
| Note: The Implications of <i>Morse v. Frederick</i>                 | 659 |
| Problem: Career Guidance and Student Protest                        | 660 |
| Problem: A Controversial T-Shirt                                    | 661 |
| Problem: Trolling on a Blog                                         | 662 |
| <br>Chapter 13 · Beyond Regulation: Whose Message Is It?            | 665 |
| A. Paying the Piper — and Calling the Tune?                         | 665 |
| <i>Rust v. Sullivan</i>                                             | 665 |
| Note: <i>Rust</i> and <i>Rosenberger</i>                            | 672 |
| Note: Government Funding of Legal Services                          | 673 |
| <i>Agency for International Development v. Alliance for</i>         |     |
| <i>Open Society International, Inc.</i>                             | 676 |
| Note: "Inside" the Program — or "Outside"?                          | 685 |
| B. When Is the Government the Speaker?                              | 686 |
| Note: The Government Speech Doctrine                                | 686 |
| <i>Walker v. Texas Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans, Inc.</i> | 690 |
| Note: Expanding the Government Speech Doctrine                      | 701 |
| <i>Matal v. Tam</i>                                                 | 702 |
| Problem: "Enhanced Underwriting" by the Ku Klux Klan                | 702 |
| Problem: Exclusion from a State's Adopt-a-Highway Program           | 704 |
| <br>Chapter 14 · Freedom of the Press                               | 705 |
| Note: What Is "The Press," Anyway?                                  | 705 |
| A. Singling Out the Press                                           | 706 |
| <i>Grosjean v. American Press Co.</i>                               | 706 |
| Note: <i>Grosjean</i> and the Free-Press Clause                     | 711 |
| <i>Minneapolis Star v. Minnesota Commissioner of Revenue</i>        | 711 |
| Note: <i>Grosjean</i> and <i>Minneapolis Star</i>                   | 718 |
| Note: Discrimination among Media Categories                         | 718 |
| Problem: Restrictions on College Newspapers                         | 721 |
| Problem: Save the Newspapers!                                       | 721 |
| B. Claims of Exemption from Generally Applicable Laws               | 722 |
| <i>Branzburg v. Hayes</i>                                           | 722 |
| Note: Justice Powell's "Enigmatic" Concurrence                      | 732 |

|                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Note: Journalists' Privilege in the Lower Courts              | 734 |
| Note: Legislative and Executive Responses to the Shield Issue | 735 |
| Note: <i>Branzburg</i> and Access to Prisons                  | 736 |
| <b>Chapter 15 • Testing the Boundaries of Doctrine</b>        | 739 |
| A. "Hate Speech"                                              | 739 |
| Note: <i>Beauharnais</i> and "Group Libel"                    | 739 |
| <i>R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul</i>                             | 740 |
| Note: The Implications of <i>R.A.V.</i>                       | 755 |
| Note: A Penalty Enhancement Statute                           | 756 |
| Note: Cross Burning Redux                                     | 758 |
| Note: Cross Burning and the First Amendment                   | 760 |
| B. Government Programs and Offensive Speech                   | 761 |
| <i>Matal v. Tam</i>                                           | 761 |
| Note: The Implications of <i>Matal</i>                        | 772 |
| C. The Internet as the New Public Square?                     | 772 |
| <i>Packingham v. North Carolina</i>                           | 772 |
| Note: The Internet as the New Public Forum?                   | 780 |
| Problem: Net Neutrality                                       | 781 |
| Problem: Posts on a Commissioner's Facebook Page              | 781 |

## PART TWO FREEDOM OF RELIGION

|                                                                      |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Chapter 16 • The History and Purposes of the Religion Clauses</b> | 785 |
| A. The Debate over the Original Understanding                        | 785 |
| <i>Everson v. Board of Education</i>                                 | 786 |
| <i>Wallace v. Jaffree</i>                                            | 789 |
| <i>Lee v. Weisman</i>                                                | 793 |
| B. History and Tradition                                             | 797 |
| <i>McCreary County v. ACLU</i>                                       | 798 |
| <i>Van Orden v. Perry</i>                                            | 802 |
| Problem: Ceremonial Deism                                            | 804 |
| Note: The Incorporation Doctrine                                     | 805 |
| C. Values                                                            | 806 |
| William P. Marshall, <i>Truth and the Religion Clauses</i>           | 807 |
| <b>Chapter 17 • The Establishment Clause</b>                         | 813 |
| A. Financial Aid to Religion                                         | 813 |
| [1] Basic Principles                                                 | 813 |
| <i>Everson v. Board of Education</i>                                 | 813 |
| Note: Two Competing Principles—"No Aid" and "Equal Aid"              | 817 |
| [2] The <i>Lemon</i> Test as Modified                                | 818 |
| <i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i>                                             | 818 |

|                                                                     |         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Note: The <i>Lemon</i> Test                                         | 823     |
| <i>Agostini v. Felton</i>                                           | 823     |
| <i>Mitchell v. Helms</i>                                            | 830     |
| [3] School Vouchers                                                 | 842     |
| <i>Zelman v. Simmons-Harris</i>                                     | 842     |
| Problem: Faith-Based Social Service Providers                       | 857     |
| B. School Prayer                                                    | 857     |
| <i>Engel v. Vitale</i>                                              | 857     |
| <i>School District of Abington Township v. Schempp</i>              | 861     |
| <i>Wallace v. Jaffree</i>                                           | 867     |
| <i>Lee v. Weisman</i>                                               | 871     |
| Problem: Drafting a Moment-of-Silence Policy                        | 877     |
| C. School Curriculum                                                | 877     |
| <i>Edwards v. Aguillard</i>                                         | 877     |
| Problem: Intelligent Design                                         | 884     |
| D. Displays in Public Places                                        | 885     |
| <i>County of Allegheny v. Greater Pittsburgh ACLU</i>               | 885     |
| <i>McCreary County v. ACLU</i>                                      | 898     |
| <i>Van Orden v. Perry</i>                                           | 908     |
| Note: Justice Breyer's Constitutional Distinctions                  | 919     |
| Problem: Atheists Cross about Highway Memorials                     | 921     |
| E. Legislative Prayer                                               | 921     |
| <i>Town of Greece v. Galloway</i>                                   | 922     |
| <br><b>Chapter 18 • The Free Exercise Clause</b>                    | <br>939 |
| A. Early Cases                                                      | 939     |
| <i>Reynolds v. United States</i>                                    | 939     |
| <i>United States v. Ballard</i>                                     | 942     |
| B. Modern Cases                                                     | 946     |
| <i>Sherbert v. Verner</i>                                           | 946     |
| <i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i>                                           | 951     |
| <i>Employment Division v. Smith</i>                                 | 959     |
| Note: Statutory Protections of the Exercise of Religion             | 968     |
| C. Discrimination against Religion                                  | 977     |
| <i>Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah</i>     | 978     |
| Problem: Police Grooming Regulation                                 | 988     |
| <br><b>Chapter 19 • Interrelationships among the Clauses</b>        | <br>989 |
| A. Definition of Religion                                           | 989     |
| <i>Torcaso v. Watkins</i>                                           | 990     |
| <i>United States v. Seeger</i>                                      | 991     |
| Note: Freedom of Conscience and the Constitution                    | 996     |
| Note: Dogma, Heresy, and Schism                                     | 999     |
| <i>Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC</i> | 1000    |



|                                                                                  |          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Problem: Peremptory Challenges                                                   | 1008     |
| B. Tensions between the Religion Clauses                                         | 1008     |
| <i>Locke v. Davey</i>                                                            | 1009     |
| Note: The Blaine Amendments                                                      | 1014     |
| <i>Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer</i>                        | 1015     |
| Problem: The Good Friday School Holiday                                          | 1030     |
| C. Religious Speech                                                              | 1030     |
| Note: The Free Speech-Public Forum Overlay                                       | 1031     |
| <i>Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia</i>          | 1032     |
| <i>Good News Club v. Milford Central School</i>                                  | 1041     |
| Problem: “Whom Do I Arrest?”                                                     | 1050     |
| Note: A Postscript on the Religion Clauses                                       | 1052     |
| <br>Appendix A • The Constitution of the United States                           | <br>1053 |
| Appendix B • The Justices of the United States Supreme Court,<br>1946–2016 Terms | <br>1063 |
| Index                                                                            | 1067     |



# Table of Cases

---

- 281 Care Committee v. Arneson, 262  
44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island,  
226, 532  
12 200-ft. Reels of Film, United States  
v., 182  
Abood v. Detroit Board of Education,  
526, 542, 587  
Abrams v. United States, 12, 81, 771  
Adamson v. California, 805  
Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña, 326  
Adderley v. Florida, 467, 479, 569, 736  
Adler v. Board of Education, 617  
Agency for International Development  
v. Alliance for Open Society  
International, Inc., 676, 766  
Agostini v. Felton, 823, 830, 835, 844,  
848, 1023  
Aguilar v. Felton, 823  
Albertini, United States v., 357  
Alberts v. California, 124, 129  
Alexander v. United States, 265  
Allegheny, County of v. Greater Pitts-  
burgh ACLU, 885, 902, 924  
Alvarez, United States v., 249, 331  
Amalgamated Food Employees Union  
v. Logan Valley Plaza, Inc., 506  
American Library Assn., Inc., United  
States v., 766  
Arcara v. Cloud Books, Inc., 395, 396  
Arkansas Writers' Project v. Ragland, 718  
Arnett v. Kennedy, 620  
Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties  
Union, 151, 174, 233, 239  
Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition, 185,  
235, 236, 301, 302, 775, 776  
Associated Press v. NLRB, 724  
Associated Press v. United States, 713,  
724  
Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Com-  
merce, 588, 590, 600  
Automobile Workers, United States v.,  
594  
Ballard, United States v., 942, 948, 962,  
999  
Baltzer v. United States, 7  
Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan, 265, 282  
Barnes v. Glen Theatre, Inc., 430, 436,  
437, 440, 743  
Barr v. Matteo, 82  
Barron v. Baltimore, 805  
Bartnicki v. Vopper, 104, 123  
Bates v. Little Rock, 578, 723, 726  
Bates v. State Bar of Arizona, 204, 302  
Batson v. Kentucky, 1008  
Bd. of Educ. of Westside Cmty. Schools  
(Dist. 66) v. Mergens, 1031  
Beauharnais v. Illinois, 75, 81, 125, 178,  
234, 739, 741  
Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser,  
592, 646  
Bigelow v. Virginia, 198  
Blackwell v. Issaquena County Board of  
Education, 641, 644  
Blair v. United States, 731  
Board of Airport Commissioners v.  
Jews for Jesus, 302  
Board of Directors of Rotary Interna-  
tional v. Rotary Club of Duarte,  
548, 555  
Board of Education v. Allen, 822  
Board of Regents of Univ. of Wis.  
System v. Southworth, 674

- Board of Trustees of State University of N.Y. v. Fox, 212, 217, 226
- Boerne, City of v. Flores, 968, 969, 973
- Bolger v. Youngs Drug Products Corp., 210
- Boos v. Barry, 309, 372, 401, 413, 428, 438, 463, 747, 749
- Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc., 34, 112, 741
- Boy Scouts of America v. Dale, 550
- Boyd v. United States, 345
- Brady v. Maryland, 635
- Brandenburg v. Ohio, 50, 54, 190, 195, 234, 239, 250, 400, 656, 657, 748, 760, 775
- Branti v. Finkel, 616, 620, 640
- Branzburg v. Hayes, 705, 713, 722
- Braunfeld v. Brown, 948, 950
- Breard v. Alexandria, 198, 713
- Brewster v. Boston Herald-Traveler Corp., 725
- Bridge, In re, 734
- Broadrick v. Oklahoma, 187, 294, 297, 741
- Brown v. Board of Education, 641
- Brown v. City of Pittsburgh, 386
- Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association, 238, 252, 327, 332, 337
- Brown v. Louisiana, 398, 441
- Brown v. Oklahoma, 162
- Buckley v. Valeo, 440, 528, 543, 567, 585, 592, 603, 606, 607
- Bullock v. Carter, 584
- Burnside v. Byars, 641, 643, 646
- Burson v. Freeman, 311, 312, 326, 373
- Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc., 970, 976
- Butler v. Michigan, 170, 172
- Cafeteria Workers v. McElroy, 617
- California Medical Ass'n v. FEC, 610
- Callahan, People v., 71
- Cameron v. Johnson, 304, 470
- Cantwell v. Connecticut, 68, 69, 70, 157, 345, 447, 454, 538, 806, 943, 961, 1026
- Capitol Square Review & Advisory Bd. v. Pinette, 1031
- Carey v. Brown, 352, 743
- Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission, 205, 532, 533, 767
- Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire, 67, 69, 95, 115, 116, 125, 157, 160, 167, 181, 197, 232, 234, 239, 250, 308, 400, 454, 741, 748
- Child Evangelism Fellowship of Md., Inc. v. Montgomery County Public Schools, 502
- Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 978
- Cincinnati, City of v. Discovery Network, Inc., 210, 212, 218, 315, 319, 362
- CIO, United States v., 593
- Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 586, 590
- City Council of Los Angeles v. Taxpayers for Vincent, 353, 361, 490, 544
- City of (see name of city)**
- Clark v. Community for Creative Non-Violence, 356, 441
- Clay, State v., 73
- Coates v. Cincinnati, 304
- Cohen v. California, 155, 160, 161, 168, 170, 239, 306, 352, 473, 582, 653, 751
- Commonwealth v. (see name of defendant)**
- Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Bd., 579
- Connally v. General Construction Co., 303
- Connick v. Myers, 107, 111, 615, 623, 625, 640
- Consolidated Edison Co. v. Public Service Comm'n, 415
- Contempt of Court of Wright, Matter of, 734
- Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., 476, 487, 1047

- Cousins v. Wigoda, 571  
 Cox Broadcasting Co. v. Cohn, 617  
 Cox v. Louisiana, 304, 307, 469, 569  
 Cox v. New Hampshire, 268, 272, 449, 463, 465  
 CSC v. Letter Carriers, 571, 572  
 Curtis Publishing Co. v. Butts, 91, 96, 97, 723  
 Curtis, Ex parte, 620  
 Cutter v. Wilkinson, 973, 976, 1025  
 Dallas v. Stanglin, 562  
 Dameron v. Washington Magazine, Inc., 106  
 Davis v. Massachusetts, 445, 446, 447, 469  
 Davis, Commonwealth v., 445, 447  
 De Jonge v. Oregon, 34, 52, 80, 268, 284, 306, 538, 806  
 Debs, In re, 290  
 Debs v. United States, 9  
 DeGregory v. Attorney General of New Hampshire, 723  
 Democratic Party of United States v. Wisconsin ex rel. LaFollette, 553  
 Dennis v. United States, 36, 51, 52  
 Doe v. Reed, 608  
 Dombrowski v. Pfister, 295  
 Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc., 86, 106, 111  
 Duncan v. Louisiana, 806  
 Edwards v. Aguillard, 800, 877, 901  
 Edwards v. South Carolina, 458, 467, 468  
 Eichman, United States v., 407  
 Elfbrandt v. Russell, 723  
 Elk Grove Unified School Dist. v. Newdow, 931  
 Elonis v. United States, 62  
 Elrod v. Burns, 527, 620, 640  
 Employment Division v. Smith, 946, 959, 968, 980, 983, 985, 987, 973, 1003, 1017  
 Engel v. Vitale, 857, 864, 872, 873, 909  
 Epperson v. Arkansas, 879  
 Erie, City of v. Pap's A.M., 430  
 Erznosnik v. City of Jacksonville, 163, 170, 240, 352, 410, 569  
 Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co., 169  
 Everson v. Board of Education, 786, 789, 793, 806, 813, 822, 849, 900, 949, 989, 1017, 1022, 1026, 1052  
 FCC v. League of Women Voters of Cal., 668, 679, 684  
 FCC v. Pacifica Foundation, 165, 177, 352  
 Federal Election Comm'n v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc., 590  
 Federal Election Commission v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life, 587, 603  
 Federal Election Commission v. National Right to Work Committee, 587, 596, 600  
 Feiner v. New York, 157, 457  
 Ferber v. New York, 232, 742  
 First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti, 586, 592, 604  
 Fiske v. Kansas, 33, 51  
 Florida Bar v. Went For It, Inc., 204  
 Florida Free Beaches, Inc. v. Miami, 440  
 Florida Star, The v. B.J.F., 122, 593  
 Follett v. McCormick, 961  
 Forsyth County v. Nationalist Movement, 272, 453, 460  
 Fowler v. Rhode Island, 981  
 Fox Television Stations v. FCC, 174  
 Frazee v. Ill. Dep't of Employment Sec., 999  
 Freedman v. Maryland, 269, 285, 723  
 Frisby v. Schultz, 114, 115, 350, 359, 475, 743  
 Frohwerk v. United States, 8  
 FW/PBS, Inc. v. Dallas, 269  
 Garcetti v. Ceballos, 625  
 Garland v. Torre, 725  
 Garner v. Board of Public Works, 617  
 Garrison v. Louisiana, 97  
 Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc., 93, 167, 201, 250, 260, 593

- Giboney v. Empire Storage & Ice Co., 131, 160, 178, 182, 183, 195, 234, 250, 310, 524, 645
- Gibson v. Florida Legislative Investigation Committee, 726, 731
- Ginsberg v. New York, 169, 170, 177, 240, 243, 644, 753
- Gitlow v. New York, 22, 29, 267, 448, 538, 806
- Givhan v. Western Line Consolidated School District, 618, 628, 631, 632, 637
- Glickman v. Wileman Brothers & Elliott, 532, 686
- Goldman v. United States, 5
- Gompers v. Bucks Stove & Range Co., 4, 5
- Gonzales v. O Centro Espirita Beneficente União do Vegetal, 969
- Good News Club v. Milford Central School, 502, 1041
- Gooding v. Wilson, 70, 160, 161, 298, 299
- Grace, United States v., 114, 487
- Grand Jury Proceedings, In re, 734
- Grand Jury Subpoena of Williams, In re, 735
- Grand Jury Subpoena, Judith Miller, In re, 732, 735
- Grayned v. City of Rockford, 303, 469, 497
- Greece, Town of v. Galloway, 922
- Greer v. Spock, 477, 478, 479, 501
- Griswold v. Connecticut, 542, 646
- Grosjean v. American Press Co., 268, 593, 706, 712, 723, 724, 729
- Hague v. Committee for Industrial Organization, 343, 414, 445, 449, 451, 452, 453, 458, 467, 474, 487
- Hamilton v. Regents, 510, 516
- Hamling v. United States, 151
- Harte-Hanks Communications, Inc. v. Connaughton, 88
- Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier, 647, 650
- Hebert v. Louisiana, 707
- Heckler v. Mathews, 544
- Heineman, United States v., 62
- Herndon v. Lowry, 35, 52
- Hess v. Indiana, 53, 190
- Hill v. Colorado, 369, 379, 384
- Hobbie v. Unemployment Appeals Comm'n of Florida, 960
- Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project, 326, 337, 372, 681, 685
- Holt v. Hobbs, 974
- Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC, 1000, 1017
- Houchins v. KQED, Inc., 712, 737
- Houston, City of v. Hill, 71, 297, 302
- Hudgens v. NLRB, 493, 507
- Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston, Inc., 532, 549
- Hustler Magazine v. Falwell, 108, 111, 116, 119, 251, 402, 751
- Hutchinson v. Proxmire, 103
- In re (see name of party)**
- International Society for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee, 485, 486, 489, 490, 491, 496, 497, 498, 502, 1031
- Interstate Circuit, Inc. v. Dallas, 133
- J.E.B. v. Alabama, 1008
- Jackson, Ex parte, 268
- Jacobellis v. Ohio, 133, 144
- Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 516
- Jenkins v. Georgia, 149
- Johanns v. Livestock Marketing Association, 534, 686, 692, 763
- Jones v. Wolf, 999
- Joseph Burstyn, Inc. v. Wilson, 168, 239
- Karalexis v. Byrne, 137
- Kedroff v. Saint Nicholas Cathedral of Russian Orthodox Church in North America, 1002
- Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 616, 617
- Knox v. Service Employees International, 530

- Kois v. Wisconsin, 140  
 Kokinda, United States v., 486  
 Kovacs v. Cooper, 171, 349, 352, 569  
 Kusper v. Pontikes, 568, 571  
 Ladue, City of v. Gilleo, 321, 328, 338, 360, 366, 374  
 Lakewood, City of v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co., 273, 367, 462  
 Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free School Dist., 1033, 1043  
 Lamont v. Postmaster General, 729  
 Lane v. Franks, 638, 640  
 Lawrence, Ex parte, 725  
 Leathers v. Medlock, 719  
 Lee v. International Society for Krishna Consciousness Inc., 486, 489, 491, 497, 498  
 Lee v. Weisman, 793, 806, 871, 911, 926, 928, 932, 934, 935  
 Lee, United States v., 714, 960  
 Legal Services Corp. v. Velazquez, 674, 679  
 Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights, 470, 478, 479  
 Lemon v. Kurtzman, 818, 826, 831, 848, 867, 878, 881, 887, 899, 900, 909, 917, 933  
 Letellier, In re, 734  
 Lewis v. City of New Orleans, 298, 299, 300  
 Linmark Associates, Inc. v. Willingboro, 361, 593  
 Littleton, City of v. Z.J. Gifts D-4, L.L.C., 270  
 Lloyd Corp., Ltd. v. Tanner, 507  
 Lochner v. New York, 26, 209, 232  
 Locke v. Davey, 1009, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1019, 1021, 1025, 1028  
 Lohrenz v. Donnelly, 105  
 Lorillard Tobacco Co. v. Reilly, 215  
 Los Angeles, City of v. Alameda Books, Inc., 417  
 Lovell v. City of Griffin, 68, 266, 268, 301, 341, 342, 344, 345, 347, 446, 449, 451, 452, 727, 729  
 Lubin v. Panish, 584  
 Lynch v. Donnelly, 887, 892, 893, 909, 927  
 Mabee v. White Plains Pub. Co., 713, 720, 724  
 Machinists v. Street, 527  
 Macintosh, United States v., 993  
 Madigan, Illinois ex rel. v. Telemarketing Associates, Inc., 251  
 Madsen v. Women's Health Ctr., 379  
 Mapp v. Ohio, 134  
 Marbury v. Madison, 235  
 Marks v. United States, 292, 429, 732  
 Marsh v. Alabama, 505, 508, 729  
 Marsh v. Chambers, 526, 800, 910, 911, 921, 922, 923, 930, 931, 933  
 Martin v. City of Struthers, 344, 348, 349, 352, 358, 359, 723, 729  
 Masses Publishing Co. v. Patten, 16, 21  
 Matal v. Tam, 702, 761  
**Matter of (see name of party)**  
 McAuliffe v. Mayor of New Bedford, 617  
 McConnell v. Federal Election Commission, 589, 590  
 McCreary County v. ACLU, 798, 898, 911, 917, 925  
 McCullen v. Coakley, 320, 368, 775, 778  
 McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission, 611  
 McDaniel v. Paty, 981  
 McGowan v. Maryland, 950  
 McGrath v. Kristensen, 437  
 McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n, 376  
 McKoy v. North Carolina, 733  
 Medure v. New York Times Co., 105  
 Meek v. Pittenger, 831, 832, 835  
 Memoirs v. Massachusetts, 139  
 Metromedia Inc. v. San Diego, 361, 744  
 Meyer v. Nebraska, 29, 542, 546, 642, 646  
 Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo, 168, 174, 575, 593  
 Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co., 108

- Miller v. California, 138, 143, 145, 146,  
 167, 170, 176, 185, 239, 250, 582,  
 742, 752  
 Miller v. United States, 732  
 Mills v. Alabama, 575, 622  
 Minersville School District v. Gobitis,  
 509, 514, 519  
 Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. v.  
 Minnesota Comm'r of Revenue,  
 396, 711  
 Mitchell v. Helms, 830, 1015, 1023,  
 1024  
 Monitor Patriot Co. v. Roy, 90  
 Morse v. Frederick, 650, 659  
 Mt. Healthy City Board of Ed. v. Doyle,  
 618  
 Mueller v. Allen, 844  
 Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 464, 961  
 Mutual Film Corp. v. Industrial  
 Comm'n of Ohio, 241  
 NAACP v. Alabama, 527, 537, 542, 558,  
 568, 571, 578, 579, 589, 716, 723,  
 726, 731, 806  
 NAACP v. Button, 80, 715, 723, 726,  
 731, 947  
 NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Com-  
 pany, 55, 195, 542, 618  
 National Endowment for Arts v. Finley,  
 766  
 National Treasury Employees Union,  
 United States v., 624  
 Near v. Minnesota, 86, 251, 267, 268,  
 274, 280, 282, 285, 290, 292, 301,  
 449, 710, 723, 729  
 Nebraska Press Ass'n v. Stuart, 309  
 New York v. Ferber, 175, 185, 235, 250,  
 294, 309, 775, 776  
 New York State Club Ass'n, Inc. v. City  
 of New York, 551  
 New York Times Co. v. Sullivan, 16, 21,  
 58, 61, 76, 90, 96, 111, 116, 120,  
 124, 132, 178, 198, 210, 250, 260,  
 306, 308, 568, 569, 575, 593, 646,  
 705, 723, 724, 729  
 New York Times Co. v. United States  
 (The "Pentagon Papers" Case), 251,  
 281, 593, 724, 729, 736  
 Niemotko v. Maryland, 306  
 Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government  
 PAC, 585  
 O'Brien, United States v., 156, 220, 309,  
 315, 357, 372, 389, 398, 406, 408,  
 429, 430, 438, 441, 519, 561, 568,  
 712, 743  
 Oklahoma Press Publishing Co. v.  
 Walling, 713, 714, 718, 720, 724  
 Old Glory Condom Corp., In re, 764  
 Oliver, United States v., 526  
 Ollman v. Evans, 109  
 Olmstead v. United States, 135  
 Organization for a Better Austin v.  
 Keefe, 279, 281, 282, 353  
 Osborne v. Ohio, 182, 235  
 OSU Student Alliance v. Ray, 503  
 Packer Corp. v. Utah, 471  
 Packingham v. North Carolina, 499, 772  
 Palko v. Connecticut, 267, 538  
 Palmore v. Sidoti, 544  
 Paris Adult Theatre I v. Slaton, 142  
 Patterson v. Colorado, 4, 6, 267  
 Pell v. Procunier, 736  
**People v. (see name of defendant)**  
 Permoli v. New Orleans, 805  
 Perry Education Association v. Perry  
 Local Educators' Association, 474,  
 478, 490, 669, 1043  
 Perry v. Sindermann, 618  
 Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc. v. Hepps,  
 108, 593  
 Pickering v. Board of Education, 529,  
 615, 616, 618, 623  
 Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 29, 542, 546,  
 813, 953, 961  
 Pipefitters v. United States, 594  
 Pittsburgh Press Co. v. Pittsburgh  
 Comm'n on Human Relations, 178,  
 713  
 Planned Parenthood v. Casey, 806



- Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc.,  
     United States v., 234, 372  
 Pleasant Grove City v. Summum, 318,  
     686, 688, 691, 763  
 Plunkett v. Hamilton, 725  
 Police Department of Chicago v.  
     Mosley, 305, 314, 319, 341, 372,  
     417, 473, 714, 717, 741, 742, 749  
 Pope v. Illinois, 150  
 Porter v. Ascension Parish School Bd.,  
     652, 659  
 Posadas de Puerto Rico Associates v.  
     Tourism Co. of P.R., 226, 745  
 Powell v. Alabama, 709, 711  
 Price v. Time, Inc., 735  
 Prince v. Massachusetts, 240, 957  
 Progressive, Inc., The, United States v.,  
     293  
 Prudential Ins. Co. v. Cheek, 24  
 PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins,  
     508, 522  
 Public Utilities Comm'n v. Pollak, 471,  
     472  
 R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, 222, 234, 242,  
     314, 320, 328, 739, 740, 772, 1033  
 Railway Employees' Dept. v. Hanson, 527  
 Railway Express Agency v. New York, 714  
 Raines, United States v., 295  
 Rankin v. McPherson, 112  
 Read, State v., 73  
 Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC, 168,  
     170, 174  
 Redrup v. New York, 134, 141  
 Reed v. Reed, 306, 307  
 Reed v. Town of Gilbert, 309, 312, 323,  
     338, 339, 366, 428, 769, 772  
 Regan v. Taxation with Representation  
     of Wash., 667, 670, 673, 678, 679,  
     684, 720  
 Regan v. Time, Inc., 357  
 Regina v. Hicklin, 127  
 Reidel, United States v., 137, 145, 146  
 Reno v. American Civil Liberties Union,  
     174, 189, 774  
 Renton, City of v. Playtime Theatres,  
     Inc., 321, 373, 407, 415, 416, 418,  
     433, 744, 746  
 Republican Party of Minn. v. White,  
     317, 326  
 Reynolds v. United States, 788, 789, 814,  
     939, 955, 960, 962  
 Rinaldo, State v., 734  
 Roberts v. United States Jaycees, 540,  
     551, 961, 1003  
 Robinson, State v., 74  
 Roe v. Wade, 198  
 Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of  
     Univ. of Va., 316, 318, 321, 374, 500,  
     629, 673, 767, 1010, 1023, 1032,  
     1043  
 Rosenblatt v. Baer, 89, 95  
 Rosenbloom v. Metromedia, Inc., 94,  
     101  
 Rosenfeld v. New Jersey, 160, 163  
 Roth v. United States, 124, 130, 134,  
     142, 146, 147, 167, 199, 234, 239,  
     285, 308, 568, 618, 741  
 Rowan v. United States Post Office  
     Dept., 352  
 Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic and  
     Institutional Rights (FAIR), 523,  
     678  
 Runyon v. McCrary, 544  
 Rust v. Sullivan, 665, 674, 678, 679, 683,  
     686, 766  
 Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois,  
     640  
 Sable Communications of Cal., Inc. v.  
     FCC, 593, 741  
 Saia v. New York, 308, 350, 440  
 San Diego, City of v. Roe, 112, 623  
 Saxbe v. Washington Post, 736  
 Scales v. United States, 47  
 Schacht v. United States, 399, 403  
 Schaumburg, Village of v. Citizens for a  
     Better Environment, 477  
 Schenck v. United States, 3, 8, 64, 167,  
     245, 276, 285, 516

- Schneider v. New Jersey, 326, 342, 344, 349, 352, 359, 440, 447, 449, 452, 491, 539, 716, 723
- School District of Abington Township v. Schempp, 806, 848, 861, 873, 909, 910, 924
- School District of Grand Rapids v. Ball, 825
- Schwimmer, United States v., 63, 768
- Scopes v. State, 879
- Seeger, United States v., 991, 996
- Shapiro v. Lyle, 516
- Shelton v. Tucker, 520, 571, 731
- Sheppard v. Maxwell, 725
- Sherbert v. Verner, 617, 946, 954, 956, 957, 960, 961, 988, 1019
- Siel, State v., 734
- Simon & Schuster, Inc. v. Members of New York State Crime Victims Board, 234, 308, 314, 593, 743
- Smith v. Cahoon, 268
- Smith v. Collin, 466, 756
- Smith v. Daily Mail Publishing Co., 123, 328
- Snyder v. Phelps, 110
- Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc., 228, 314, 771
- Southeastern Promotions, Ltd. v. Conrad, 265, 478, 484, 593
- Speiser v. Randall, 82
- Spence v. Washington, 398, 441
- St. Amant v. Thompson, 87
- Stanley v. Georgia, 134, 139, 145, 148, 172, 184, 189, 775
- Stansbury v. Marks, 516
- State v. (see name of defendant)**
- Stevens, United States v., 70, 182, 232, 239, 243, 245, 248, 250, 336, 769
- Stone v. Graham, 900, 902, 910, 915, 917
- Street v. New York, 402, 405
- Stromberg v. California, 399, 441
- Sweezy v. New Hampshire, 539, 571, 731
- Terminiello v. Chicago, 80, 157, 400, 453, 458, 643, 646, 751
- Texas v. Johnson, 309, 396, 397, 406, 430, 438, 440, 441, 741, 748, 754, 760, 806
- Thomas v. Chicago Park District, 269, 271
- Thomas v. Collins, 723, 948
- Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Employment Sec. Div., 960, 999
- Thornhill v. Alabama, 295, 301
- Time, Inc. v. Firestone, 102, 593
- Time, Inc. v. Hill, 593, 617
- Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District, 158, 395, 398, 441, 641
- Torcaso v. Watkins, 528, 990
- Tory v. Cochran, 281
- Town of (see name of town)**
- Treasurer of the Committee to Gerald D. Lostracco v. Fox, 262
- Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer, 1015, 1066
- Turner Broadcasting System v. FCC, 593, 678
- Twining v. New Jersey, 707
- United Foods, United States v., 530, 533, 686
- United Public Workers v. Mitchell, 617
- United States v. (see name of defendant)**
- Valentine v. Chrestensen, 79, 197, 198, 345
- Van Orden v. Perry, 801, 802, 908, 924, 933, 938
- Vernonia School Dist. 47J v. Acton, 653
- Village of (see name of village)**
- Virginia State Board of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, Inc., 197, 209, 221, 234, 250, 409, 532
- Virginia v. Black, 61, 704, 740, 756, 758, 760
- Virginia v. Hicks, 302
- Virginia, Ex parte, 79
- Vogelgesang, People v., 516

- Walker v. Texas Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans, Inc., 689, 690, 763, 772
- Wallace v. Jaffree, 789, 793, 808, 867, 900, 1029
- Walz v. Tax Commission, 819, 1009, 1025
- Ward v. Rock Against Racism, 229, 309, 312, 314, 356, 372, 432, 743, 774, 777
- Watts v. United States, 60, 250, 744
- Welsh v. United States, 996
- Wepplo, People v., 126
- West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 399, 509, 519, 528, 561, 678, 685, 939, 943, 961
- Whitney v. California, 27, 51, 52, 53, 136, 159
- Widmar v. Vincent, 478, 483, 484
- Wieman v. Updegraff, 617
- Williams v. Rhodes, 574
- Williams, United States v., 191, 194, 195, 261, 304
- Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar, 324
- Williamson v. Lee Optical Co., 200, 410, 413
- Winters v. New York, 133, 238, 248
- Wisconsin v. Mitchell, 756
- Wisconsin v. Yoder, 946, 951, 961
- Witters v. Commission for Blind, 1010
- Witters v. Washington Dept. of Servs. for Blind, 827, 845, 1013
- Wolman v. Walter, 831, 832, 835
- Wood v. Georgia, 85
- Wooley v. Maynard, 517, 518, 550, 671, 678, 689, 695, 961
- Yates v. United States, 46, 52, 156
- Young v. American Mini Theatres, Inc., 178, 408, 427, 438, 593
- Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 290
- Zelenka v. State, 734
- Zelman v. Simmons-Harris, 806, 842, 1010, 1023, 1025
- Zemel v. Rusk, 724, 729, 736
- Zerilli v. Smith, 735
- Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School Dist., 826, 845
- Zorach v. Clauson, 799, 861, 863, 1052
- Zurcher v. Stanford Daily, 733



# Preface to the Fourth Edition

---

The First Edition of our Casebook was published in 2006. As we explained in the Preface to that work (reprinted immediately following), the book's content and organization were shaped by our belief that, from a lawyer's perspective, the First Amendment is above all else *law* —albeit a special kind of law. One thing that is special is that First Amendment law is found primarily in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Close analysis of those precedents is thus the principal tool that lawyers must rely on when seeking to persuade a judge or when negotiating with an adversary on behalf of a client. One purpose of our book was to help students learn how to best deploy that tool. To that end, we provided versions of the opinions that were relatively complete; we also organized the cases in accordance with the Court's own categories and the temporal development of the doctrines within those categories.

The Second and Third Editions of the book were published in 2010 and 2014, respectively. While the Third Edition added a new section (in Chapter 3) highlighting the sequence of decisions in which the Court steadfastly refused to expand the universe of unprotected speech, the Second and Third Editions otherwise hewed closely to the organization of the First Edition.

This Fourth Edition adheres to the organizational *principle* that has guided us through the prior editions, but because the Court's decisions have moved in some new directions, the organization itself features some significant changes. Most notably, while the first four chapters (Chapters 1–4) retain their pre-existing pride of place, the next four chapters (Chapters 5–8) now cover, respectively, the rule against content discrimination; time, place, and manner regulations; expressive conduct and the secondary effects doctrine; and the public forum doctrine. We moved up this material primarily to reflect the increased emphasis the Court has placed on the content-neutrality rule, especially in the new leading case of *Reed v. Town of Gilbert* (2015). That change, in turn, prompted us to move up our discussions of the doctrines that follow from that rule. Simply put, the content-neutrality rule has achieved a sufficiently central status in First Amendment doctrine that it merits students' early and careful attention, after they have encountered the historically foundational cases addressing unprotected speech categories (Chapters 1 and 2), partially or potentially unprotected categories (Chapter 3), and prior restraints, vagueness, and overbreadth (Chapter 4). Our belief is that early exposure to concepts such as content neutrality and strict scrutiny will make the later materials more accessible to students.

A second organizational change is to give campaign finance regulation its own chapter (Chapter 11), in recognition of the growing (and largely self-contained) body

of First Amendment doctrine governing that subject. This new chapter immediately follows the chapter on freedom of association, consistent with the grounding of the doctrine in “the right to associate with the political party of one’s choice” in *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976). By contrast, we retired the earlier editions’ chapter on new technologies and distributed its most important content among Chapter 3 (*FCC v. Pacifica Foundation* (1978)) and Chapter 15 (*Packingham v. North Carolina* (2017)). We made this change partly to keep the book at a manageable length, but primarily because some of the cases in that now-deleted chapter (most notably the spectrum scarcity cases growing out of *Red Lion Broadcasting v. FCC* (1969)) have likely become sufficiently marginalized and irrelevant to students’ experiences as to become less important and pedagogically satisfying.

Chapter 15 concludes Part I of the book, and focuses on three areas that each implicate multiple, cross-cutting aspects of free speech law. The section on “hate speech” remains from the corresponding chapter from the earlier editions, and it is followed by *Matal v. Tam* (2017), the decision that struck down the disparagement provision of federal trademark law, and *Packingham v. North Carolina* (2017), which invalidated the state’s law against convicted sex offenders accessing social media. The debate over “hate speech” undoubtedly remains current today in the popular culture. *Matal* engages that debate, while also broaching the fascinating and pedagogically important question of how to analyze, for First Amendment purposes, programs such as the federal trademark regime. Finally, *Packingham* features potentially broad language about the importance of social media in the marketplace of ideas as well as musings about the First Amendment-protected status of the Internet as a public forum — along with a pointed caution about those musings from the concurring Justices.

Overall, the organization and the structure of Part Two on Freedom of Religion have required little change over three editions, but the Fourth Edition incorporates modest modifications to reflect the Supreme Court’s recent handiwork. In Chapter 16 (“The History and Purposes of the Religion Clauses”) we added a new section to introduce students to the values underlying the Religion Clauses. Chapter 17 (“The Establishment Clause”) includes a new section on Legislative Prayer that features *Town of Greece v. Galloway* (2014). In Chapter 18 (“The Free Exercise Clause”) an extensive new note summarizes various statutory provisions that are important other protections of religious liberty. Chapter 19 (“Interrelationships Among the Clauses”) has been revamped to emphasize the line of precedents that includes *Locke v. Davey* (2004) and the very recent decision in *Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia v. Comer* (2017).

In addition to these organizational and structural changes, the Fourth Edition, like those before it, features smaller-scale alterations to reflect recent developments and also to ensure that material is presented as compactly as possible. In particular, following a practice that we initiated for the Third Edition, some principal cases have been condensed down to essential extracts in extended Notes. We have done this because we want to keep the foundational older opinions that define the landscape of First Amendment law but also to include the significant recent decisions that alter the contours or expand the boundaries — all the while allowing the Justices to speak

for themselves. It is simply not possible to do all that and treat every important case as a principal case. But even when we have condensed some cases to Notes, we have endeavored, as much as possible, to present the material through extended quotations from the Justices' own language. We believe these Note versions are sufficiently complete to support meaningful class discussion.

We also continue to include Problems as a key pedagogical tool. These Problems have been carefully designed to require students to analyze the cases and use them as lawyers do to make or respond to arguments. For this edition, we reviewed all of the Problems in the Third Edition. Most of them have worked well in the classroom, and we have kept them, sometimes with minor updating or tweaking. But we have dropped Problems that did not work well or that seemed outdated and have added some new ones.

With this edition Professors Hellman, Araiza, and Baker welcome as a co-author Professor Ashutosh A. Bhagwat of the University of California at Davis School of Law. The three incumbent authors are delighted that he has joined the book and they extend their great appreciation for his many contributions to the Fourth Edition.

ARTHUR D. HELLMAN  
hellman@pitt.edu

WILLIAM D. ARAIZA  
bill.araiza@brooklaw.edu

THOMAS E. BAKER  
thomas.baker@fiu.edu

ASHUTOSH A. BHAGWAT  
aabhagwat@ucdavis.edu





# Preface to the First Edition

---

The title of our new First Amendment casebook is “First Amendment Law.” The emphasis on “law” is not simply a matter of nomenclature. The First Amendment can be viewed as history, as policy, and as theory, but from a lawyer’s perspective, it is above all *law*—albeit a special kind of law. One thing that is special is that the governing texts have receded into the background. *The law is the cases, and the cases are the law.* Close analysis of precedent is therefore the principal tool of argumentation and adjudication. The purpose of this book is to help students to learn the law in a way that will enable them to use it in the service of clients. This process entails skills as well as knowledge.

Constitutional topics like the First Amendment are not often thought of as vehicles for skills training, but they can be, and we hope that in our book they will be. Moreover, the skills we seek to impart will be valuable to students not just in the realm of the First Amendment, but in any area where lawyers must rely on close analysis of precedent when seeking to persuade a judge or an adversary on behalf of a client. Four principal features of the book will help students to master these skills.

First, the cases have been edited with a relatively light hand. If students read cases in severely abridged versions that include only the essential passages, they will be greatly handicapped when they are required to use cases in their sprawling unabridged original form. Supreme Court opinions are so long today that some abridgement is necessary, but our versions are generally more complete than those of other casebooks.

Second, the structure of the book has been designed to reinforce the students’ understanding of what the cases establish and what they leave open. Commentators—and sometimes casebook authors—attempt to impose their own structure on the law of the First Amendment. But for a lawyer seeking to persuade a judge or an adversary, the structure that matters is the structure that the Supreme Court has created. Using that structure as the starting point (while raising questions about it in the note material) enables students to see how the cases build upon one another—or move in new directions.

Third, the book concentrates on the main lines of development and their implications for future disputes rather than traveling down every byway of doctrinal refinement. Each year, the Supreme Court adds as many as 10 new decisions to the already-voluminous body of precedent interpreting the First Amendment. No one can possibly master all of that law through a single law school course. Nor is there any need to do so; if the student is familiar with the principal lines of doctrine, the refinements can easily be fitted into the mental picture that those lines delineate.

Finally, in editing the cases we have acted upon the premise that the Justices' own treatment of precedent can provide a uniquely valuable perspective for gaining an understanding of First Amendment doctrines—their content, their evolution, and their interrelationships. This is so, in part, because not all precedents are equal. While the total number of Supreme Court decisions is large, the body of precedents that the Justices invoke outside their immediate context for more than platitudes or abstractions is relatively small. Most of those cases are included in this Casebook. And in editing the Justices' opinions, we have retained all references to those cases (other than string cites and the like). This enables students to see how the Justices use precedent to build their arguments; it also reinforces students' understanding of the doctrines and ideas covered in previous chapters. As students encounter the landmark precedents again and again, each time approaching them from a different direction, they will come to appreciate the First Amendment landscape as a whole as well as the contours of its individual features.

*Supporting materials.* As the preceding account suggests, our overriding principle in designing the casebook has been to give primacy to the Justices' own words and the Court's own doctrinal structure. But we have also provided guidance in working with the opinions. Ultimately students will have to learn to work with lengthy cases entirely on their own, but a casebook can help. The notes and questions in this book direct students' attention to critical language in Court opinions, to apparent inconsistencies between decisions addressing similar issues, and to point-counterpoint face-offs between majorities and dissents.

The notes and questions make use of a variety of sources. For example, we have drawn on the rich material now available in the archives from the private papers of the Justices—preliminary drafts of opinions, memorandum exchanges between Justices, and even notes of the Justices' private conferences. These shed light on what was established by existing precedents and how a new decision changes (or does not change) the law.

We also exploit another of the characteristics that makes First Amendment law special: the law is made by a small number of individuals—the Justices of the Supreme Court—and bears the imprint of their individual philosophies as well as their collective judgments. Tracing the views of individual Justices can contribute to an understanding of the larger issues that the members of the Court address in different contexts over a period of years. This provides a vehicle for seeing the connections between doctrines that is internal rather than external.

To assist in that endeavor, Appendix B lists the Justices serving on the Court in every Term starting with 1946. Knowing the volume of the United States Reports in which an opinion is published, you can find who was on the Court at that time. And by seeing who dissented or concurred, you can see which Justices joined in the majority.

Finally, the book includes some problems. These problems have been designed from the overall perspective of the book; their primary purpose is to encourage a close reading of precedent and an understanding of what that precedent stands for. Most of the problems are based on actual cases.

As is evident, we have cast our net widely in writing and compiling the non-case material in this casebook. In part, this is because different approaches work better for different topics. But we also believe that the variety itself makes the course more interesting for the teacher as well as the student. However, the goal remains the same: to enhance the student's understanding of—and ability to use—the law of the First Amendment.

*Legal eloquence.* There are special rewards in studying the First Amendment. No other area of law has so often inspired the Justices of the Supreme Court to write opinions marked by eloquence and passion. And because words are the lawyer's stock in trade, study of these opinions is a profitable enterprise even for the student who will never litigate a First Amendment case.

Most of the great opinions have been written in defense of First Amendment rights; here you will find memorable language from Holmes, Brandeis, Hughes, Jackson, Harlan, and Brennan—to name only some of the Justices of the past. But there is eloquence on the other side as well, perhaps best illustrated by the writings of Frankfurter and (again) Jackson.

*Editing of cases.* Although we have gone further than most casebooks in retaining the content of the Justices' opinions, we have not hesitated to adjust matters of format in the interest of readability. (Thus, the cases should not be used for research purposes.) In this, we have followed familiar conventions. Specifically: Omissions are indicated by brackets or ellipses; alterations are indicated by brackets. Most footnotes have been omitted; however, footnotes in opinions and other quoted material retain their original numbers. Citations to cases other than those in the Casebook have generally been deleted. Brackets and internal quotation marks have been omitted from quoted material within cases. Lengthy paragraphs have sometimes been broken up to promote readability.



# Acknowledgments

---

Professor Hellman expresses his thanks for the dedicated efforts of Faculty Secretary Patricia Blake and research assistance by Linda Tashbook of the Library staff. He expresses his appreciation for research support from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law.

Professor Araiza thanks his research assistants: Marvin Espana, Giancarlo Martinez, Rebecca Meyer, and Michael Tal, as well as his faculty assistants: Simone Clemente and Maria Raneri. He also expresses his deep appreciation to Dean Nick Allard of Brooklyn Law School for encouraging his work even while he served as Vice Dean.

Professor Baker appreciates the dedicated efforts of his research assistants: Andrew Figueroa—who performed yeoman service with the copyright permissions—along with Andrew Balthazor, Patrick Brady, Tal Knight, Tucker Pryor, and George Zeckler. He also thanks Veronica Torres for her unfailing staff support. Finally, he does not take for granted the research support of the Florida International University College of Law and the encouragement of former Dean R. Alexander Acosta.

Professor Bhagwat thanks the UC Davis School of Law as well as Deans Kevin Johnson and Madhavi Sunder for generous and unflagging support.

Special thanks go from all of the authors for the dedicated efforts of the staff of the Document Technology Center at the University of Pittsburgh School of Law: LuAnn Driscoll, Barbara Salopek, Karen Knochel, Darleen Mocello, and Vicki DiDomenico.

## Permissions

Epstein, Steven B., *Rethinking the Constitutionality of Ceremonial Deism*, 96 COLUM. L. REV. 2083, 2084–85 (1996). Copyright © 1996 Columbia Law Review. All rights reserved. Reprinted by permission.

Excerpt from ACTIVE LIBERTY: INTERPRETING OUR DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION by Stephen Breyer, Copyright © 2005 by Stephen Breyer. Used by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, an imprint of the Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, a division of Random House LLC. All rights reserved.

THE SUPREME COURT IN CONFERENCE: THE PRIVATE DISCUSSIONS BEHIND NEARLY 300 SUPREME COURT DECISIONS (1940–1985), at 433 (Del

Dickson ed., 2001). Copyright © 2001 Oxford University Press. Reprinted by Permission of Oxford University Press, USA.

- For Electronic Edition—The Supreme Court in Conference—The Private Discussions Behind Nearly 300 Supreme Court Decisions (1940–1985) 433 (Del Dickson ed., 2001). Copyright © 2001 Oxford University Press. Reprinted by Permission of Oxford University Press, USA. [www.oup.com](http://www.oup.com).

William P. Marshall, *Truth and the Religion Clauses*, 43 DEPAUL L. REV. 243, 244-56 & 260-68 (1994). Copyright DEPAUL LAW REVIEW. Reprinted with permission.