

7-30-2009

Censorship-Free Libraries on US v. ALA

Concerned West Bend Citizen

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.uwm.edu/west_bend_library_challenge



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Concerned West Bend Citizen, "Censorship-Free Libraries on US v. ALA" (2009). *West Bend Community Memorial Library (Wisconsin)*, 2009. 384.

https://dc.uwm.edu/west_bend_library_challenge/384

This Blog Post is brought to you for free and open access by UWM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Bend Community Memorial Library (Wisconsin), 2009 by an authorized administrator of UWM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact open-access@uwm.edu.

Thursday, July 30, 2009

[Censorship-Free Libraries on US v. ALA](#)

Both [Dan Kleinman](#) and [Ginny Maziarka](#) frequently attempt to justify the acceptability of censorship in libraries by quoting from the Supreme Court ruling from the 2003 case [United States v. American Library Association](#).

I've been meaning to write a post showing the fallacy of relying on this decision to support their cause. The decision is very narrowly focused (as all Supreme Court rulings are) on the constitutionality of Congress requiring public schools and libraries receiving [E-Rate](#) discounts to install [web filtering software](#) as a condition of receiving federal funding.

Yes, Justice Kennedy's separate but concurring opinion states "The interest in protecting young library users from material inappropriate for minors is legitimate, and even compelling, as all Members of the Court appear to agree." But that is just a comment, and not part of the legal issue in question. Whether there is an interest in protecting kids from Internet porn wasn't the issue; the issue was whether Congress could force filters as a condition of funding.

Each statement within a ruling is not precedent; *this* statement is not precedent and does not have the force of law.

For more on this, see [today's post on Censorship-Free Libraries](#). Thankfully s/he took the time for a more lengthy discussion on the inappropriate reliance on this ruling by Ginny & Co.

UPDATE: Censorship-Free Libraries has more superb analysis of the (non)applicability of US v. ALA to the West Bend library controversy [here](#).