

No 02-361
In the Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellant

v.

**AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, et al.,
Appellees**

On Appeal From the U.S. District Court
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania

**BRIEF *AMICI CURIAE* OF PARTNERSHIP FOR
PROGRESS ON THE DIGITAL DIVIDE, THE GAY
LESBIAN STRAIGHT EDUCATION NETWORK,
HARLEM LIVE, PACIFIC NEWS SERVICE,
PEACEFIRE, ROCK OUT CENSORSHIP, TRUCE, and
WIRETAP MAGAZINE, IN SUPPORT OF
APPELLEES**

Marjorie Heins
Counsel of Record
Free Expression Policy Project
275 Seventh Ave., 9th floor
New York, NY 10001
(212) 807-6222

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	
I. Digital Technology Has Given Rise to a “Digital Divide” That Puts A Number of Demographic Groups at a Serious Disadvantage in Accessing the Increasingly Essential Resource of the Internet	3
A. The Internet is Now Essential to Participatory Citizen Discourse, Job Searching, Obtaining Health Information, Learning About Government Programs, and Day-to-Day Research on Many Other Topics	3
B. Lower-Income People, the Elderly, the Disabled, Those Living in Rural Areas, Those With Limited English Skills, and Other Demographic Groups Lack Full Access to the Internet or the Skills and Training to Use It, But Public Libraries Have Helped Bridge the Gap	5
1. <u>The Scope of the Digital Divide</u>	5
2. <u>The Role of Libraries</u>	9

II	Internet Filters Undermine the Progress That Libraries Have Made in Bridging the Gap Among Demographic Groups, and Hence Exacerbate the Digital Divide	14
A.	Filters by Their Nature, and Even at Their Most “Minimal” Settings, Block Large Amounts of Valuable, Non-Pornographic Information	14
B.	Filters Obstruct the Process of Communication Central to a Participatory Democracy	18
C.	Filters Undermine the Core Functions of Libraries in a Democracy, With Especially Harsh Consequences For Those Already Harmed By the Digital Divide	21
III.	CIPA’S Mandate of Internet Filters as a Condition of LSTA or E-rate Funding Violates the First Amendment Rights of all Library Users, Especially Those on the Underside of the Digital Divide	26
A.	The District Court Correctly Found that the Internet is a Public Forum; Hence, It Appropriately Applied Strict Scrutiny to CIPA	26
B.	Because It Forces Libraries to Delegate Decisions to Private Filtering Companies Whose Products’ Operation is Inherently Irrational, CIPA Fails Any Level of First Amendment Scrutiny, Including Rational Basis Review	28
	CONCLUSION	29
	APPENDIX: DESCRIPTION OF <i>AMICI</i>	A-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Board of Education v. Pico</i> , 457 U.S. 853 (1982)	19
<i>Cammarano v. United States</i> , 358 U.S. 498 (1959)	28
<i>First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti</i> , 435 U.S. 765 (1978)	19
<i>Kleindienst v. Mandel</i> , 408 U.S. 753 (1972)	19
<i>Lamont v. Postmaster General</i> , 381 U.S. 301 (1965)	19
<i>Legal Services Corp. v. Velazquez</i> , 531 U.S. 533 (2001)	27
<i>Martin v. Struthers</i> , 319 U.S. 141 (1943)	19
<i>Perry v. Sindermann</i> , 408 U.S. 593 (1972).	28
<i>Regan v. Taxation With Representation</i> , 461 U.S. 540 (1983)	27-28
<i>Reno v. ACLU</i> , 521 U.S. 844 (1997)	3, 19
<i>Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of Univ. of Va.</i> , 515 U.S. 819 (1995)	26
<i>Rust v. Sullivan</i> , 500 U.S. 173 (1991)	26-27
<i>Thomas v. Collins</i> , 323 U.S. 516 (1945)	19
<i>United States v. Sofsky</i> , 287 F.3d 122 (2d Cir. 2002)	4

