

## ARTISTIC FREEDOM IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

The book examines in detail the essence, nature and scope of artistic freedom as a human right. It explains the legal problems associated with the lack of a precise definition of the term ‘art’ and discusses the emergence of a distinct ‘right’ to artistic freedom under international law. Drawing on a variety of case studies, primarily from the field of visual arts, but also performance, street art and graffiti, it examines potentially applicable ‘defences’ for those types of artistic expression that are perceived as inappropriate, ugly, offensive, disturbing or even obscene and transgressive. The book also offers a view on global controversies such as *Charlie Hebdo* and the Danish cartoons, attempting to explain the subtleties of offences related to religious sensibilities and beliefs. It also examines the legitimacy of restrictions on extremist expressions in the case of arts involving criminal acts such as child pornography.

**Eleni Polymenopoulou** is Associate Professor of Law at College of Law, Hamad Bin Khalifa University, and Adjunct Associate Professor at Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University. She is also practising artist, children’s book author and illustrator.

# Artistic Freedom in International Law

ELENI POLYMEÑOPOULOU

Hamad Bin Khalifa University



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment  
978-1-108-84420-8 — Artistic Freedom in International Law  
Eleni Polymenopoulou  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom  
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA  
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia  
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India  
103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781108844208](http://www.cambridge.org/9781108844208)

DOI: 10.1017/9781108933667

© Eleni Polymenopoulou 2023

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2023

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

NAMES: Polymenopoulou, Eleni, author.

TITLE: Artistic freedom in international law / Eleni Polymenopoulou.

DESCRIPTION: 1. | Cambridge, UK ; New York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2023. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2022043094 (print) | LCCN 2022043095 (ebook) | ISBN 9781108844208 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108928427 (paperback) | ISBN 9781108933667 (epub)

SUBJECTS: LCSH: Law and art. | Copyright–Art. | Art–Censorship. | Obscenity (Law) | Freedom and art. | Art and religion. | Blasphemy–In art. | Blasphemy–Law and legislation. | Artists–Legal status, laws, etc.

CLASSIFICATION: LCC K3778 .P65 2023 (print) | LCC K3778 (ebook) | DDC 344/.097–dc23/eng/20230105

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022043094>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022043095>

ISBN 978-1-108-84420-8 Hardback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

## Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page</i> xi
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xiii
<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>1 Defining Art</b>	10
1.1 Defining Art in Theory of Art	11
1.1.1 Classical Approaches to Art	12
1.1.1.1 Does Art Mean Making Beautiful Things?	12
1.1.1.2 Does Art Mean Imitating Reality?	13
1.1.2 Modern Theories of Art	14
1.1.2.1 Modern Artistic Practice and Its Influence on Modern Artistic Theories	15
1.1.2.2 Art as an Open Concept	17
1.1.2.3 Danto and the Institutional Theory of the Arts	18
1.1.3 Contemporary Art Theories	20
1.2 Defining Art in Law	22
1.2.1 Why the Law Should Not Provide a Definition of the Arts	22
1.2.2 The Law Does Not Offer a Definition of the Arts	24
1.2.2.1 Non-definition of the Arts under Cultural Heritage Law	24
1.2.2.2 Non-definition of the Arts under Intellectual Property Law	26
1.2.3 Challenges Arising from the Problem of Non-definition of the Concept of ‘Art’	27
1.2.3.1 Exceptions to Rules of General Application	28
1.2.3.2 Classification of Artists and Artworks	29

1.2.3.3	Legitimate Limitations or Negation of the Qualification of Art?	33
	Concluding Remarks	36
<b>2</b>	<b>The Nature, Scope and Protection of Artistic Freedom</b>	<b>38</b>
2.1	The Emergence of a Distinct Right to Artistic Freedom	40
2.1.1	Issues of Terminology: Creation, Expression or Entertainment?	40
2.1.2	The Input of Constitutional Traditions	42
2.1.2.1	The Legacy of the Weimar Constitution	42
2.1.2.2	The Legacy of the French Genre of Caricature	44
2.2	The Nature of Artistic Freedom	47
2.2.1	The Free Enjoyment of the Arts in Light of Article 27 of the UDHR	48
2.2.2	The Free Speech Approach to Artistic Freedom	49
2.2.3	Cultural and Collective Aspects of Artistic Freedom	51
2.3	The Scope and Institutional Protection of Artistic Freedom	53
2.3.1	The Protection of Artistic Freedom by UNESCO	53
2.3.2	The Practice of International Human Rights Bodies	56
2.3.2.1	The Practice of the UN Human Rights Committee	56
2.3.2.2	The Practice of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	57
2.3.3	The Practice of Regional Human Rights Bodies	59
2.3.3.1	Artistic Freedom in the Context of the European System	59
2.3.3.2	Artistic Freedom in the Context of the Inter-American System	62
2.3.3.3	Artistic Freedom in the Context of the African System	64
	Concluding Remarks	66
<b>3</b>	<b>Censorship and Restrictions</b>	<b>68</b>
3.1	Arts Should Be Free: Abstaining from Censorship in the Arts	70
3.1.1	Legitimate or Illegitimate Censorship?	70
3.1.1.1	Lack of Clarity in International Standards	71
3.1.1.2	The Hate Speech Exception	76
3.1.1.3	Negationism, Revisionism and Holocaust Denial	80

3.1.2	Challenging Prior Restraints before Human Rights Bodies	82
3.1.2.1	An Obligation of Most Careful Scrutiny	83
3.1.2.2	Challenging Classification for Theatre, Video Art and Cinematography	85
3.1.2.3	Challenging Censorship in Painting and the Visual Arts	87
3.2	Minimal Restrictions in the Exercise of Artistic Freedom	89
3.2.1	Subsequent Imposition of Liability	89
3.2.2	Balancing Conflicting Interests at the ECtHR	90
3.2.2.1	Effectively Protecting the Arts	90
3.2.2.2	Restrictions or Duties and Responsibilities?	92
3.2.3	Preventing Private Actors from Interfering?	93
3.2.3.1	Private Exhibitions and Events	93
3.2.3.2	Digital Art and Social Media	96
	Concluding Remarks	97
<b>4</b>	<b>Positive Obligations in Relation to Artistic Freedom</b>	<b>99</b>
4.1	Providing Effective Judicial Remedies	101
4.1.1	Effective Remedies against Censorship in Performance, Art and Music	101
4.1.2	Reparations for Demolition of Art Installations	103
4.2	Positive Obligations under the ICESCR	103
4.2.1	Obligations Relevant to Participation in Cultural Life	103
4.2.1.1	Artistic Freedom and Participation in Cultural Life	104
4.2.1.2	Shaping Collective Cultural Representations	106
4.2.2	Positive Obligations Relevant to Artistic Freedom and Practice	107
4.2.2.1	Take Steps . . . by All Appropriate Means	107
4.2.2.2	To the Maximum of Its Available Resources	108
4.2.2.3	Achieving Progressively	111
4.2.3	The Application of the 4-A Scheme in Artistic Freedom	111
4.3	Non-discrimination and Equality Obligations in the Art Worlds	115
4.3.1	Towards the Elimination of Discriminatory Practices against Artists and Creatives	115
4.3.1.1	Towards Elimination of Direct Discrimination	115

4.3.1.2	Towards Elimination of Indirect Discrimination	118
4.3.1.3	Eliminating Discrimination in the Digital Art World	119
4.3.2	Real Equality in the Art World	121
4.3.2.1	Is Real Equality Ever Possible?	121
4.3.2.2	Affirmative Action and Artistic Freedom	122
	Concluding Remarks	126
<b>5</b>	<b>Street Art, Graffiti and Art in Public Space</b>	<b>128</b>
5.1	The Human Rights Law Perspective on Graffiti and Street Art	130
5.1.1	Definitions of Graffiti and Street Art	130
5.1.1.1	Terminology Issues	130
5.1.1.2	Transgressive or Mainstream?	131
5.1.2	Graffiti as a Grey Area in Law	135
5.1.2.1	Legal Treatment in Domestic Laws	135
5.1.2.2	State Obligations under Human Rights Law	136
5.1.2.3	Arguments against Removal from the Public Space	138
5.1.3	Street Art for Future Generations?	141
5.1.3.1	Murals and the Preservation of Cultural Identities	141
5.1.3.2	Murals as Urban Cultural Heritage	144
5.2	Artistic Freedom, Cultural Heritage and Urban Planning	146
5.2.1	Is Contemporary Street Art Cultural Heritage?	146
5.2.1.1	La Demeure du Chaos (Abode of Chaos)	146
5.2.1.2	The Legacy of 5Pointz	149
5.2.2	Unpopular Art and the Urban Space	152
5.2.2.1	A Human Rights Law Perspective to Richard Serra's <i>Tilted Arc</i>	152
5.2.2.2	Debates on Racist and Sexist Art in the Public Space	155
	Concluding Remarks	157
<b>6</b>	<b>Public Morality, Obscenity and the Arts</b>	<b>159</b>
6.1	Evil, Worthless and Immoral Arts	161
6.1.1	The Contextuality of Morality Considerations	161
6.1.1.1	Is There a Universal Standard of Morality?	161
6.1.1.2	Obscenity Treaties and Lack of Agreement	163

<i>Contents</i>		ix
6.1.2	The Applicable Legal Framework	165
6.1.2.1	UNESCO, Plato and Human Rights Law	165
6.1.2.2	Who Is the Average Person?	166
6.1.3	Artistic Value as an Oxymoron	169
6.1.3.1	To Pronounce or Not to Pronounce on Artistic Value?	169
6.1.3.2	Art Value for Funding	172
6.2	Obscenity, Artistic Defences and the Human Body	174
6.2.1	Defences against Obscenity for Fine Arts and Performance	174
6.2.1.1	Painting, Sculpture and the Artistic Genre of Nude	175
6.2.1.2	Bodily Harm in Performance Art	176
6.2.2	Human Dignity and Cadaver Art	178
6.2.2.1	The Exhibition <i>Body Worlds (Korpewelte)</i>	178
6.2.2.2	Human Rights Concerns in Relation to Cadaver Art	180
6.2.3	Paedophilia and Child Pornography as a Hard Case	182
6.2.3.1	The Problem of Child Pornography in Fine Arts and Photography	182
6.2.3.2	Japanese Manga and <i>Lolicons</i>	185
6.2.3.3	Raising Awareness about Child Pornography	187
	Concluding Remarks	188
7	<b>Blasphemous Paintings, Cartoons and Other Religiously Offensive Art</b>	190
7.1	Local and Global Controversies	193
7.1.1	A Divide between Religious and Secular States?	193
7.1.1.1	The Decline of Purely Religious Arts	193
7.1.1.2	Persistence of Religious Offences	194
7.1.1.3	The Unique Approach of the US Supreme Court to Religious Offences	198
7.1.2	The Rise of Globalized Cultural Conflicts	200
7.1.2.1	Blasphemous Arts and Cartoons across Religious Traditions	200
7.1.2.2	What Does the Sharia Actually Say?	204
7.2	The Approach of Human Rights Bodies	208
7.2.1	Key Elements of Religious Offences in the Arts	208
7.2.1.1	What Are Intentional Offences?	208
7.2.1.2	The Impact of the Work	210



7.2.2 Where Would UN Human Rights Bodies Draw the Line?	211
7.2.3 Where Would the European Court Draw the Line?	213
Concluding Remarks	217
<i>Index</i>	221

## Acknowledgements

What makes art great is not only and not in the first place the high quality of what is created. Rather, art is great because it is an ‘absolute need’.

—Nietzsche

The book is the fruit of many years of research on the intersections between art and the law. It incorporates findings from research conducted during my doctoral thesis in the sphere of human rights law (and specifically controversies over arts and religion) (2006–11); a year of studying art sociology (2005–06); several years of teaching (human rights law, media law and public international law, among others, as well as a course on ‘art, media and cultural politics’ at Georgetown University Qatar); and a short fellowship awarded by UCL Qatar in 2019 (Museum and Gallery Studies department), focusing on cultural heritage and the Islamic legal tradition. This book is also the product of personal insights and experience, including at Ormerakis School of Applied Arts in Athens (where I studied comics, illustration and 2D animation between 1997 and 2001).

A wholehearted ‘thank you’ to my husband for his encouragement and tremendous support, without which this book project would have never been realized. The writing process has not been easy, given that it coincided with Covid-19, partial school closures and a number of other difficulties. I would like to thank my family and close friends too, as well as my colleagues and students – present and former – for all the fruitful discussions we have had.

I would also like to thank all those artists, painters, musicians, performers, iconographers, illustrators and cartoonists whom I met during the past twenty years, many of whom I worked and developed enduring friendships with. They have contributed the most to my vision about ‘artistic freedom in international law’, although they may not be aware of it. This book is dedicated also to them.

## Table of Cases

### AFRICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN AND PEOPLES' RIGHTS

*Frente para a Libertação do Estado de Cabinda v Angola* App no 328/06 (2013)

### AFRICAN COURT ON HUMAN AND PEOPLES' RIGHTS

*Lohé Issa Konaté v Burkina Faso* App no 004/2013 (2014)

### COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

*Mohammed Hassan Gelle v Denmark*, UN Doc CERD/C/68/D/34/2004 (2006)

*Stephen Hagan v Australia*, UN Doc CERD/C/62/D/26/2002 (2003)

*TBB-Turkish Union in Berlin/Brandenburg*, UN Doc CERD/C/82/D/48/2010 (2013)

### COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

*Eva-Maria Painer v Standard Verlags GmbH* C-145/10, ECLI:EU:C:2011:798

### EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

*Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v UK* (1985) 7 EHRR 471

*Ahmet Yıldırım v Turkey* App no 3111/10

*Airey v Ireland* (1980) 2 EHRR 305

*Akdaş v Turkey* App no 41056/04

*Alekhina and Others* App no 38004/12

*Alınak v Turkey* App no 40287/98

- Alves da Silva v Portugal* App no 41665/07  
*Appleby v United Kingdom* App no 44306/98  
*Association Ekin v France* App no 39288/98  
*Ben El Mahi and Others v Denmark* App no 5853/06  
*Beyeler v Italy* App no 33202/96  
*Bladet Tromsø and Stensaas v Norway* App no 21980/93  
*Castells v Spain* (1992) 14 EHRR 445  
*Chauvy and Others v France* App no 64915/01  
*Choudhury v United Kingdom* (1991) 12 HRLJ 172  
*Cumpănă and Mazăre v Romania* App no 33348/96  
*De Haes and Gijssels v Belgium* App nos 7/1996/626/809  
*Delphi AS v Estonia* App no 64669/09  
*Dorota Rabczewska against Poland* App no 8257/13  
*Dubowska and Skup v Poland* App nos 33490/96 and 34055/96  
*Ehrmann and SCI VHI v France* App no 2777/10  
*Eon v France* App no 26118/10  
*E.S. v Austria* App no 38450/12  
*Faurisson v France* App no 550/1993  
*Feldek v Slovakia* App no 29032/95  
*Flux v Moldova* no 6 App no 22824/04  
*Garaudy v France* App no 65831/01  
*Handyside v United Kingdom* (1979) 1 EHRR 737  
*Hoare v UK* [2011] ECHR 722  
*İ.A. v Turkey* App no 42571/98  
*Informationsverein Lentia and Others v Austria* [1993] ECHR 57  
*Jelševar and Others v Slovenia* App no 47318/07  
*Karademirci and Others v Turkey* App nos 37096/97 and 37101/97  
*Karataş v Turkey* App no 23168/94  
*Karttunen v Finland* App no 1685/10  
*Klein v Slovakia* App no 72208/01  
*Kuliś and Różycki v Poland* App no 27209/03  
*Lambert and Others v France* App no 46043/14  
*Lehideux et Isorni v France* App no 24662/94  
*Leroy v France* App no 36109/03  
*Lindon, Otchakovsky-Laurens and July v France* (2008) 46 EHRR 35  
*Lingens v Austria* App no 9815/82  
*Mandreigelya v Russia* App no 34310/13  
*Manole and Others v Moldova* App no 13936/02  
*Marcx v Belgium* (1980) 2 EHRR 330  
*Mățăsararu v The Republic of Moldova* App nos 69714/16 and 71685/16

## Table of Cases

xv

- M'Bala M'Bala v France* App no 25239/13  
*Modinos v Cyprus* App no 15070/89  
*Müller and Others v Switzerland* App no 10737/84  
*Murat Vural v Turkey* App no 9540/07  
*Norwood v UK* (2005) 40 EHRR SE11  
*N. v Switzerland* App no 9870/82  
*Noyan Özkan v Turkey* App no 23886/94  
*Observer and Guardian v United Kingdom* (1992) 14 EHRR 153  
*Otto-Preminger-Institut v Austria* [1994] ECHR 66  
*Pay v UK* App no 32792/05  
*Perinçek v Switzerland* App no 27510/08  
*Perrin v UK* App no 5446/03  
*Petr Andreyevich Pavlenskiy v Russia* App no 18965/16  
*Prager and Oberschlick v Austria* App no 15974/90  
*Pryanishnikov v Russia* [2019] ECHR 614  
*S. and G. v UK* App no 17634/91  
*Samodurov and Vasilovskaya v Russia* [2009] ECHR 2207  
*SAS v France* [2014] ECHR 695  
*Stoll v Switzerland* App no 69698/01  
*Sunday Times v UK* (1979) 2 EHRR 245  
*Tatár and Fáber v Hungary* App nos 26005/08 and 26160/08  
*Thlimmenos v Greece* (2001) 31 EHRR 411  
*Ulusoy and Others v Turkey* App no 34797/03  
*Unifaun Theatre Productions Ltd and Others v Malta* App no 37326/13  
*V.D. and C.G. v France* App no 68238/01  
*Vereinigung Bildender Künstler v Austria* (2008) 47 EHRR 5  
*Welsh and Silva Canha v Portugal* App no 16812/11  
*Wingrove v UK* App no 17419/90

## HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

- Allan Singer v Canada*, UN Doc CCPR/C/51/D/455/1991 (1994)  
*Belyazeka v Belarus*, UN Doc CCPR/C/104/D/1772/2008 (2012)  
*Claudia Andrea Marchant Reyes et al. v Chile*, UN Doc CCPR/C/121/D/2627/2015 (2017)  
*Coleman v Australia*, UN Doc CCPR/C/87/D/1157/2003 (2006)  
*Drobek v Slovakia*, UN Doc CCPR/C/60/D/643/1995 (1997)  
*Hak-Chul Shin v Republic of Korea*, UN Doc CPR/C/80/D/926/2000 (2004)  
*John Ballantyne et al. v Canada*, UN Doc CCPR/C/47/D/359/1989 (1993)  
*Laptsevich v Belarus*, UN Doc CCPR/C/68/D/780/1997 (2000)

*Rafael Marques de Morais v Angola*, UN Doc N Doc CCPR/C/83/D/1128/2002 (2005)  
*Toonen v Australia*, UN Doc CCPR/C/50/D/488/1992 (1994)

## INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

*Francisco Martorell v Chile*, Case 11.230, OEA/Ser.LN/II.95 Doc 7 rev, 234 (1997)  
*Granier et al. (Radio Caracas Television – RCTV) v Venezuela* (2015)  
*Javier Ortega Reyes, Paúl Rivas Bravo & Efraín Segarra Abril v Colombia & Ecuador*, Resolution (2018)  
*Leaders of the 19 de Abril Carazo Movement and Others v Nicaragua* (2018)  
 Report N° 31/98, Petition no 11.803 (1997)

## INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

*Canese v Paraguay*, Series C no 111 (2004)  
*Compulsory Membership in an Association Prescribed by Law for the Practice of Journalism* Advisory Opinion OC-5/85, Ser A no 5 (1985)  
*Hellera Ulloa v Costa Rica*, Series C no 107 (2004)  
*Olmedo Bustos et al. v Chile*, OC-73/2001, Ser C 73 (2001) [*Last Temptation of Christ*]

## NATIONAL COURTS

*Canada*

*Johnson v The Queen* (1973) 13 C.C.C. (2d) 402  
*R. v Sharpe* [2001] 1 SCR 45  
*R v Verette* (1978) 2 SCR 838

*Chile*

Supreme Court Judgment (1997) [*Last Temptation of Christ*]  
 Santiago Court of Appeal Case, 16 September 2013 [*Mapocho River Installation*]

*England and Wales*

*Attorney General v Guardian Newspapers Ltd* (no 1) [1987] UKHL 13  
*Hensher v Restawile* [1976] A.C. 64

*Table of Cases*

xvii

*Jefferys v Boosey* (1854) 4 HLC 815  
*Lucasfilm Limited and Others v Ainsworth* [2011] UKSC 39  
*Shaw v Director of Public Prosecution* [1962] AC 220

*France*

Cass, Civil Ch.1, 85-15.044 (1987)  
 Cass, Civil Ch.2, 98-17.574 (2001)  
 Cass, Civil Ch. 2, 99-10.490 (2001)  
 Cass, Criminal Ch., 05-81.932 (2006)  
 Cass. 1 no 06-19.021 (2008)  
 Tribunal Grande Instance, order (2009)  
 Lyon Appeal Court Judgment (2004) [*Demeure du Chaos*]  
 Paris First Instance Judgment, 17th Chamber (2007)  
 Lindon, Court of Cassation (2002)  
*Marithé et François Girbaud* (2005)

*Germany*

BVerfGE 119 (2007) [*Esra*]  
 BVerfGE 30 (1971) [*Mephisto*]  
 BVerfGE 75 [*Strauß-Karikatur*]  
*Pictures on the Berlin Wall, Re* (Case I ZR 68/93) [1997] ECC 553

*Greece*

Athens First Instance Court Judgment (2003) [*Life of Christ*]  
 Athens First Instance Court Judgment 17115/1988 [*Last Temptation of Christ*]

*India*

*Maqbool Fida Husain v Raj Kumar Pandey and Others* (2007) 5 SCC 11  
*Phantom Films Pvt. Ltd. and Anr v The Central Board Of Certification*  
 (2016) SCC 3862  
*Sujato Bhadra v State of West Bengal*, 22 September 2005, 2005 (4)  
 CHN 601

*Israel*

*Noah Films v Censorship Council* PD 30 (1) 757  
 Supreme Court Judgment HC 806/88

*Japan*

Supreme Court of Japan, *Ichii et al. v Japan* 23 Keishu 10, 15 October 1969  
 [Marquis De Sade's Prosperities of Vice]  
 Supreme Court of Japan, *Koyama v Japan* (1957) 11 Keishu 997, 13 March  
 1957 [Lady Chatterley's Lover]

*Korea (South)*

South Korea Constitutional Court (1999) 26 November 1999  
 South Korea Constitutional Court, 10-1 KCCR 327, 95 Hun-Ka 16

*Poland*

Constitutional Court Judgment SK 54/13 (2015)

## USA

*Alberts v California* (1957) 354 US 476  
*Aubin v City of Chicago* (unreported)  
*Bantam Books, Inc. v Sullivan* 372 US 58 (1963)  
*Barnes v Glen Theatre, Inc.* 501 US 560  
*Beauharnais v Illinois* 343 US 250 (1952)  
*Board of Education, Island Trees Union Free School District No 26 v Pico*  
 457 US 853 (1982)  
*Boos v Barry* 485 US 312 (1988)  
*Brandenburg v Ohio* 395 US 444 (1969)  
*CBS Corp. v FCC* no 06-3575 (3d Cir. 2 November 2011)  
*Chaplinsky v New Hampshire* 315 US, 568 US (1942)  
*Cohen v California* 403 US 15 (1971)  
*Cohen v G & M Realty (Aerosol Art Center Inc.)* Case no 13-CV-05612(FB)  
 (RLM) (E.D.N.Y. 13 June 2018) [5Pointz]  
*Constantin Brancusi v United States* no 209109 (U .S. Customs Ct., 3d Div.,  
 21 October 1927)



## Table of Cases

xix

- English v BFC&R East 11th Street LLC* 97 Civ No 7446 (HB) (SDNY 1997)  
*FCC v Pacifica* 438 US 726 (1978)  
*Feist Publications, Inc., v Rural Telephone Service Co.* 499 US 340 (1991)  
*Fields v Twitter Inc.* 200 F. Supp. 3d. 964, 967–68 (N.D. Cal. 2016)  
*Hannegan v Esquire* 327 US 146 (1946)  
*Hoehling v Universal City Studios* 449 US 841 (1980)  
*Hustler Magazine, Inc. v Falwell* 485 US 56  
*Jacobellis v Ohio* 378 US 184 (1964)  
*Joseph Burstyn, Inc. v Wilson* 343 US 495 (1952)  
*Korematsu v United States* 323 US 214 (1944)  
*Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v Colorado Civil Rights Commission* 584 US (2018)  
*Memoirs v Massachusetts* 383 US 413 (1966)  
*Miller v California* 413 US 15 (1973)  
*Mutual Film Corporation v Industrial Commission of Ohio* 236 US 230 (1915)  
*NAACP v Claiborne Hardware Co.* 458 US 886 (1982)  
*Near v Minnesota* 283 US 697 (1931)  
*New York State Club Ass'n v City of New York* 487 US 1 (1988)  
*New York Times Co. v Sullivan* 376 US at 376 US 270  
*New York Times Co. v United States* 403 US 713 (1971)  
*PGA Tour Inc. v Martin* (2001) 204 F.3d 994  
*R.A.V. v St Paul* 505 US 377 (1992)  
*Redgrave v Boston Symphony Orchestra, Inc.* 855 F.2d 888 (1st Cir.1988)  
*Roth v United States* (1957) 354 US 476  
*Serra v United States General Services Administration* 664 F.Supp. 798 (S.D.N.Y.1987)  
*Shenck v USA* 249 US 47 (1919)  
*Snyder v Phelps* 562 US 443 (2011)  
*Stromberg v California* 283 US 359 (1931)  
*Texas v Johnson* 491 US 397 (1989)  
*Verizon v FCC*, US Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit (2014)  
*Walker v Sons of Confederate Veterans* 115 S.Ct. 2239 (2015)