

---

# Freedom of Speech



---

## What is “Freedom of Speech”?

- You can say anything?
- You can say most things, subject to some restrictions?
- What might those restrictions be?
- Does the Internet change anything?

---

## The First Amendment

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

---

## A Core American Value

- Restrictions exist
- What these are has varied over time
- Obscenity, “fighting words”, “clear and present danger”, etc.
- Some justices think that that’s wrong:

It should be noted at the outset that the First Amendment provides that “Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.” That leaves, in my view, no room for governmental restraint on the press.

*New York Times Co. v. United States*, 403 U.S. 713 (1971), Justice Douglas, concurring

---

# “Abridging the Freedom of Speech, or of the Press”

- Note the distinction between “speech” and “the press”
- Many things qualify as “speech”
- The “press” has a long-standing traditional role as a public critic

---

# The Traditional Press

- Traditional newspapers and other publishers
- Radio and television
- Cable TV

---

# Characteristics

- Corporate structures
- High financial barrier to entry
- Some content-based regulation of radio and TV: limited spectrum forces the government to make allocation decisions
- Other regulation must be content-neutral

---

# Speech

- Originally, just that: speech
- Were private pamphlets and leaflets “speech” or “press”?
- (Such pamphlets and leaflets were an important dissident activity in colonial times; the concept was not unknown to the authors of the Bill of Rights.)
- Since then, many other activities, including things like dancing, art, flag-burning, and more have been held to be speech within the meaning of the First Amendment
- It is now held to protect *expression*

---

# Protected Speech

To block some speech, a “compelling government interest” must be shown. The restraint must be narrowly tailored, and its beneficial effects are measured against the harm it causes.

**Political speech** Very heavily protected; “compelling interests” are rare or non-existent

**Ordinary speech** Still well-protected, but there may be context issues, i.e., graphic nudity in a scientific or legitimate artistic context, as opposed to the same images designed to titillate

**Commercial speech** Can be restricted (e.g., tobacco ads)

---

## Some Speech is Never Protected

- Obscenity—but *very* hard to define
- 👉 “[P]erhaps I could never succeed in intelligibly doing so. But I know it when I see it”. (Justice Potter Stewart, 378 U.S. 184 (1964))
- Speech inciting dangerous actions—as opposed to ideas—can be outlawed. Note: there must be a direct, immediate relationship relationship, not a general statement like “I think that all X should be killed.”

---

## Libel

- In the U.S., a statement must be *factual, false, and defamatory* to be libelous
- To libel a “public figure”, the statement must be not just false; rather that the “statement was made with ‘actual malice’ – that is, with knowledge that it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false or not.” (*New York Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964))
- Statements of opinion, by definition, are never libelous

---

## Enter the Net

- The net changed everything
- There was no longer a high barrier to entry
- Or was there?

---

## The Net is Decentralized

- The Internet was designed to be decentralized
- Slightly older technologies—Usenet, FIDO, dial-up “bulletin boards”—required only a PC and a modem to participate

---

## A Court's View

“It is no exaggeration to conclude that the Internet has achieved, and continues to achieve, the most participatory marketplace of mass speech that this country—and indeed the world—has yet seen. The plaintiffs in these actions correctly describe the ‘democratizing’ effects of Internet communication: individual citizens of limited means can speak to a worldwide audience on issues of concern to them. Federalists and Anti-Federalists may debate the structure of their government nightly, but these debates occur in newsgroups or chat rooms rather than in pamphlets. Modern-day Luthers still post their theses, but to electronic bulletin boards rather than the door of the Wittenberg Schlosskirche.”  
(*ACLU v. Reno*, 929 F. Supp. 824 (1996))

---

## But...

- You don't connect to the "Internet", you connect to an ISP
- Anyone can create an ISP—but anyone can create a newspaper
- More and more of the net is controlled by large ISPs
- Is there a problem?

---

## Internet Structure

- Big ISPs—the so-called “Tier 1”s—*peer* with each other at multiple points, and generally share the cost of the physical interconnection
- Small ISPs purchase *transit* from big ISPs. They may or may not peer with each other; they also may peer at *exchange points*
- ☞ Many (but not all) consumer ISPs are in this category
- End-sites, including colos (colocation facilities), buy connectivity from one or more ISPs

---

## Publishing: Individuals

- Consumer ISP—but some have restrictions on what you can do
- From Verizon Online Terms of Service: “[I]t is a violation of the Agreement and this AUP . . . (k) use the service in any fashion . . . in a manner that is obscene, sexually explicit, **cruel or racist in nature or which espouses, promotes or incites bigotry, hatred or racism**;  
([http://www.verizon.com/about/sites/default/files/Internet\\_ToS\\_01172016\\_v16-1\\_Updated1.13.2016.pdf](http://www.verizon.com/about/sites/default/files/Internet_ToS_01172016_v16-1_Updated1.13.2016.pdf))
- The government could not impose such restrictions; such speech, though distasteful, is protected
- Employers generally have more stringent policies

---

## Some ISPs Didn't Like Free Speech

- “You may NOT use the Service. . . to damage the name or reputation of Verizon, its parent, affiliates and subsidiaries” (Verizon, in 2007)
- (AT&T had a similar clause in its terms of service)
- “Saying it had the right to block ‘controversial or unsavory’ text messages, Verizon Wireless has rejected a request from Naral Pro-Choice America, the abortion rights group, to make Verizon’s mobile network available for a text-message program.” (New York Times)
- All of those policies were changed after the press noticed them. . .

---

## Publishing: Small Group

- Often use a hosting service
- Example: Pair Networks says “Adult-oriented sites, designed for entertainment or commercial purposes, are not allowed on pair Networks servers.”  
(<http://www.pair.com/policies/adult.html>)
- Other companies have their own restrictions

---

## Publishing: Larger Organization

- Put a server in a “colo”—a co-location facility
- Requires system administration expertise
- Cost: about \$100/month for a small server
- May be bandwidth-limited; more bandwidth consumption increases costs

---

## Your Own Location

- Expensive—must pay for “local loop” to provider, as well as the provider’s fee
- Typical total cost is several thousand dollars/month
- Need your own machines, staff, etc.
- Generally for larger companies only
- But—fewest restrictions

---

## What's the Point?

- Connecting cheaply often comes with publishing restrictions
- Usually, the restrictions aren't onerous
- At times, especially in copyright cases, web sites do pull the plug

---

## Examples

- Diebold (which made widely-criticized electronic voting machines) demanded that ISPs pull down allegedly-copyrighted content (Diebold found liable; the judge said “no reasonable copyright holder could have believed that the portions of the email archive discussing possible technical problems with Diebold’s voting machines were protected by copyright”)
- Uri Geller, the alleged psychic, got YouTube to yank a video critical of him (Geller backed down in an out-of-court settlement)
- YouTube’s Content-ID system flagged a video of a cat purring as infringing copyright (<https://torrentfreak.com/youtube-flags-cat-purring-as-copyright-infringing-music-1>)

---

## Big Brother versus Little Brother

- As noted, the First Amendment does not apply to private parties
- More and more, online access is controlled by a few large companies.
- Is this a problem?
- So far, it hasn't been too serious—but for some content, overseas servers have been safer

---

## Who is Responsible for Content?

- A lot of content is user-created
- Should the ISP be responsible for policing it? The Web site operator?
- Last year, Youtube said that “300 hours of video are uploaded to YouTube every minute.”
- The story on [www.nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com) about the Brussels attack has more than 2,000 comments
- And how should ISPs police encrypted traffic?

---

## §230 of the Communications Decency Act

- US law: if something is improper, the individual who posted it is the liable party
- ISPs are protected from liability for user-created content
- However, they may have to take down offending content if properly notified of the problem
- This applies only if they're more or less passive conduits, and do not exercise editorial control
- Libel? Copyright infringement? The site operator isn't at risk.

---

## (The Communications Decency Act)

- A 1996 law that criminalized using “any interactive computer service to display in a manner available to a person under 18 years of age, any comment, request, suggestion, proposal, image, or other communication” that is (in effect) obscene
- In other words, it would criminalize adult web sites that didn’t do age verification
- It was struck down by the Supreme Court, but §230 survived.
- Obviously, no such ban exists today...

---

## Is Computer Code “Speech”?

- If source code is speech, it is protected by the First Amendment.
- Is code purely functional? If so, it is not protected
- Is code expressive as well as functional? Only a few courts have opined on this, but they generally have concluded that code *is* speech.
- However—in all of these cases, part of the point of the code was to make an expressive point.

---

## Quotes

- 6th Circuit, *Junger v. Daley*, 209 F.3d 481 (2000): “Likewise, computer source code, though unintelligible to many, is the preferred method of communication among computer programmers.  
“Because computer source code is an expressive means for the exchange of information and ideas about computer programming, we hold that it is protected by the First Amendment.”
- 2nd Circuit, *Universal Studios v. Corley* 273 F.3d 429, (2001): “But the fact that a program has the capacity to direct the functioning of a computer does not mean that it lacks the additional capacity to convey information, and it is the conveying of information that renders instructions ”speech” for purposes of the First Amendment.”
- Similar analysis by the 9th Circuit, in an opinion withdrawn for procedural reasons.

---

## Apple versus the FBI

- If code is speech, can a court compel Apple to write code?
- Note that Apple has stated that they find such code offensive
- But if it's purely functional, they can be compelled to cooperate

---

## Apple versus the FBI: Signatures

- All boot images for iOS must be digitally signed by Apple
- Is the signature speech, saying, “We, Apple, attest to the quality of this software”?
- Or is it a mere functional access control mechanism?

---

## Speech on the Web: Good News

- Generally, very cheap and easy to post things—the court was right; very low barrier to entry
- Without too much effort, it's possible to find ISPs and hosting companies that have many fewer restrictions
- Controversial content is easily mirrored outside the US (i.e., Wikileaks)—and can sometimes be found in Google's cache...

---

## Speech on the Web: Bad News

- Increasing concentration of power
- Increasing use of lawsuits to force takedown of material
- Increasing push for regulation and censorship by many governments

---

# Anonymity

- Anonymity is often a vital part of free speech
- Many lawsuits seek to discover the poster's identity
- More on this on Monday

---

## Student Speech Online

- What can (pre-college) students say online?
- On-campus, students have free speech rights unless they “materially and substantially disrupt the work and discipline of the school.”  
(*Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District*, 393 U.S. 503 (1969))
- Can web sites, Facebook postings, etc., done from home be regulated by schools?
- Courts have disagreed; will likely end up in the Supreme Court soon

---

## Blogger Rights

- Bloggers, of course, have full First Amendment protections
- But—are they “journalists”?
- In some states, journalists have special privileges, such as protecting sources
- Not yet clearly settled

---

# Was I a “Journalist” in the Eyes of the Law?



Across the street from SIPA, Spring '72

---

## Look Who's There...



Outside Hamilton Hall, Spring '72