

Form memo re presentation format – for presentations about free speech/intellectual freedom/civil discourse -- including sample (potential) interview questions for Nadine Strossen to discuss – prepared by Nadine Strossen -- last updated 3/29/24

Interview format for opening presentation (to be followed by audience Q&A)

My preferred format for a presentation – which I have used for almost all of my many speaking engagements for the past half-dozen or so years, and which has consistently been well-received by diverse audiences – is to be interviewed (usually by one interviewer, but also quite regularly by two or even more panelists). Rather than presenting my opening remarks through a conventional talking-head monologue, the same information is elicited in a Q&A format, which is more engaging and dynamic. Another advantage of the interview format – beyond its more dynamic quality – is that it permits the fine-tuning of each presentation to the specific aspects of the broad themes that are of special interest/concern to the particular audience.

After this opening portion of the program, it is turned over to the audience, for audience members to ask their questions.

This format has worked well for a wide array of audiences and forums, including even formal occasions such as Convocation and other titled campus lectures. Interviewers have also been varied, including: university Presidents, Provosts, Chancellors, Deans, Trustees, and other officers; faculty members from a range of fields; university staff members, including from DEI and Student Affairs offices; students (including middle and high school students, when I have spoken at their schools); government officials; human rights activists; religious leaders; and journalists.

My bottom-line goal is to tailor each presentation -- in format as well as substance—to the needs/preferences of each invitor/forum, so if you might conclude that you prefer my opening remarks to be presented via a conventional lecture format, I'll gladly deliver one. In any event, I thank you for at least giving serious consideration to the proposed interview format, in light of audiences' consistently enthusiastic responses to it.

Examples of past presentations in interview format

Google (and other online search tools) should easily lead you to links of many videos of presentations I have made in interview format for diverse audiences and forums. For example, here is a link to an interview by the prominent journalist and longtime CNN commentator Jeffrey Toobin, conducted at the Jewish Community Center in Sherman, CT on January 7, 2024: [JCC in Sherman - YouTube](#)

For some campus presentations, interview format involving student panelists (again to be followed by audience Q&A)

One way of implementing the preferred interview format, which has proven highly successful for campus (and high school/middle school) presentations, is involving leaders of a diverse array of student groups, each to ask one question, on behalf of its membership. This approach engages student members -- as well as leaders -- of the groups in advance, and also encourages their attendance.

One recent example (February 2024) was at Suffolk Law School, where I was initially interviewed by Suffolk Law School Professor David Yamada (an internationally eminent anti-harassment, anti-bullying expert and advocate), who asked several key questions, and I was then asked one question each by a panel of student leaders from diverse groups, including the: Black

Law Students Association, Jewish Law Students Association, Moot Court Association, Muslim Law Students Association, Outlaw (the LGBTQ+ group), and the Women’s Law Association,. There was an overflow crowd, and the accolades and enthusiasm afterward were so great that Prof. Yamada wrote about it for his well-respected blog and said that in the future, he and other faculty colleagues who had attended had concurred that other “lectures” (I had been invited to present a titled annual lecture) would follow the same type of interactive format. Here is a link to his blog post, which includes a photo of the event: [Let’s safeguard free speech, while learning how to engage in more constructive conversations about difficult topics « Minding the Workplace \(wordpress.com\)](#)

Potential titles

Many hosts have come up with their own titles, which is just fine with me! But many ask me for ideas. To signal both the topic and the format, it is helpful to have both a main title and a subtitle. For example: “Freedom of Speech: A Conversation with Nadine Strossen.” Alternative main titles might include: “Current Free Speech Controversies”; “Hot Topics in Free Speech”; “Does Free Speech Go too Far?” Alternative subtitles might include: “An Interview of Nadine Strossen by [insert name(s)]”; or “A Conversation between Nadine Strossen and [insert name(s)].”

Interview questions: overall considerations

Topics

Please note that I would be happy to field any question that relates to the general interrelated areas of free speech, academic freedom, and civil discourse – from the most general to the most specific. I am happy to address broad, basic questions of a timeless nature – for example, what are the purposes of free speech – as well as specific questions that are currently in the news – for example, issues presented by the many First Amendment cases pending before the Supreme Court. All such topics are of such widespread concern, and subject to so much discussion, that most people have many pertinent questions just “off the top of their heads.” Nonetheless, many interviewers have asked me to suggest sample questions from which they could potentially draw, which I have been happy to do; the below sample questions are listed in no particular order of preference.

In light of the sample questions, I want to stress again that I am glad to give interviewers free rein to ask whatever questions they choose – and that of course includes discretion not to include any/all of the sample questions!

It bears repeating that another advantage of the interview format – beyond its more dynamic quality – is that it permits the fine-tuning of each presentation to the specific aspects of the broad themes that are of special interest/concern to the particular audience.

I depend on and thank each interviewer for posing questions that are likely to be of greatest interest to the particular audience and forum at the specific event.

I’m also delighted to meet in advance (via phone, Zoom, etc.) with event organizers and/or interviewers to discuss which questions might be the most important to include in the particular event.

Timing/Number of opening questions

As with all aspects of each presentation, I defer to the judgment and preferences of my host. Nonetheless, I am regularly asked about what timing/numbers of questions have worked well in the past.

In my experience, most programs are scheduled to run for about 90 minutes total, with 45-60 minutes allocated for the opening presentation, and the remainder allocated for audience Q&A. These topics are of such widespread general concern, that there is never a shortage of audience questions; indeed, on some occasions, the organizers have chosen to weight the program mostly toward audience Q&A, with only brief stage-setting introductory questions by the moderator. As a general rule of thumb, based on my experience, I have concluded that at 1/3 of the total time should be reserved for the audience participation portion, and perhaps as much as 1/2.

The questions all raise complex matters, which cannot be answered briefly. Accordingly, interviewers should assume that we're not likely to get through more than 10 questions/answers, and perhaps even fewer. My advice to all interviewers in prioritizing questions is the following: Assume that I would only have time to answer ONE question; what should that question be? Then assume that I would only have time to answer TWO questions; what would the 2nd question be? Etc.....

Advance consultation about proposed questions: at the organizers' option

I am completely happy to answer questions spontaneously, with no advance consultation with the moderator about which questions s/he will pose (even if the questions aren't drawn from my samples). If, though, the interviewer/organizers would prefer to show me the proposed questions in advance, I'm happy to review and provide my feedback. Both approaches have worked equally well.

Sample questions – grouped by topical categories

I have listed sample questions in the following categories (neither the categories, nor the questions within each category, are listed in any order of preference):

General questions about free speech controversies

Questions about specific current free speech controversies

Questions from my new book, *Free Speech: What Everyone Needs to Know*® (Oxford University Press 2023): The twelve most common, most challenging questions about/arguments against free speech

Questions about hate speech – related to my 2018 book, *HATE: Why We Should Resist It with Free Speech, Not Censorship* (Oxford University Press 2018)

Questions about the forthcoming reissued edition of my book, *Defending Pornography: Free Speech, Sex, and the Fight for Women's Rights* (originally published by Scribner in 1995, to be republished for the NYU Classics Series on Mar. 5, 2024, with a new Preface)

Questions about free speech controversies in the wake of the October 7, 2023 Hamas terrorist attacks on Israel

Questions about academic freedom/free speech on campus in general

Questions about academic freedom/free speech at law schools in particular

Questions about free speech rights in public and school libraries

Questions about minors’ free speech rights, including in public schools

.....

General questions about free speech controversies

You have been writing and speaking about freedom of speech non-stop for quite a few years now. Why have you made this such an important priority?

Give us your elevator pitch in favor of free speech.

Free speech has become very controversial, even among groups who traditionally have supported it, including many professors, students, journalists, librarians, and publishers. Why has this happened, and what steps would you propose to increase support for free speech?

.....

Questions about specific current free speech controversies

>Many federal and state officials, of both major political parties, have supported restrictions on Tik Tok, citing concerns about national security and minors’ privacy. Do these restrictions violate the First Amendment?

>Judges and other experts have been debating whether major online platforms should be treated as “common carriers” or “public utilities,” which would have to serve as neutral conduits for all speech and speakers, rather than enforcing their own “community standards” and engaging in their own “content moderation.” Would this approach be consistent with the First Amendment? Would it be a good idea?

>One of the few issues on which many leading Democrats and Republicans agree with each other is that “Section 230” of the Communications Decency Act should be repealed or at least revised – to eliminate or reduce the immunity that online platforms currently enjoy for content posted by third parties. For example, that position was advocated by both Joe Biden and Donald Trump during the last Presidential campaign. What is Section 230 immunity and do you think it should be repealed or revised?

>Especially in the wake of COVID and the 2020 Presidential election, the most controversial kind of speech has become disinformation – including about those two topics. The concern is that such disinformation can seriously harm health – even life itself – and our democratic form of government. How does First Amendment law now draw the line between protected and

punishable disinformation, and should that line be redrawn – to give the government more power to punish more disinformation?

>Ever since Elon Musk expressed an interest in purchasing Twitter (now X), there has been constant controversy about his statements and actions, including his early pledge to increase free speech on the platform. What do you think are the most important lessons from the recent developments with Twitter/X?

>In the wake of the “Twitter Files,” “Facebook Files,” and Congressional hearings and judicial rulings about them, there has been much discussion about the relationships between many government officials and agencies, and the major social media platforms, concerning the platforms’ “content moderation” decisions. Are the government officials unduly coercing or conspiring with the companies to remove certain content, or are the officials simply encouraging the companies to do so? What are the First Amendment rights – and wrongs – in these kinds of situations?

>A federal court in Florida recently held that Florida’s “Stop Woke Act” violates the First Amendment. Please explain that law, and the many other similar laws around the country, and what First Amendment problems they present.

>There has been a lot of controversy about so-called “cancel culture.” What does that term mean? And isn’t criticizing someone, and even advocating their punishment, itself an exercise of free speech? So why do critics complain that cancel culture undermines free speech?

>Many conservatives and Republicans complain about censorship coming from the left: for example, “cancel culture” on campus and in the larger public sphere, and social media content moderation policies that (allegedly) discriminate against conservative ideas and speakers. Conversely, many liberals and Democrats complain about censorship from the right: for example, the many state laws that restrict curricula at the K-12 and even campus levels, and the many attempts to ban books in public and school libraries. Who’s right about this? Which group poses the biggest danger to free speech?

>In the recent past, there have been many high-profile examples of students and faculty members who have been punished for expression on the ground that it is offensive – for example, the art history professor who lost a job at Hamline University for showing a slide of a classic work of Islamic art that depicted the prophet Muhammad. Hamline University’s President stated that “respect, decency, and appreciation of religious and other differences should supersede” academic freedom. Do you agree? What limits should there be on expression on campus – both in classrooms and in other campus settings?

>On January 6, 2021, Donald Trump made an incendiary speech to a crowd that then attacked the Capitol, resulting in great harm, including physical injuries and deaths of police officers and others, and endangering our democratic republic. Does First Amendment law permit his speech to be punished? If not, should the law be revised?

>There have been debates about whether the federal indictments of Donald Trump violate the First Amendment. What are the arguments pro and con?

>In June, the Supreme Court decided one of the many recent cases involving tensions between free speech rights and public accommodation laws: when providers of various expressive services decline to provide such services for same-sex weddings because of religious objections. The Supreme Court case involves a custom website designer who will provide the same web design services to all customers, regardless of who they are, but who will refuse to design for anyone websites that promote messages that violate her beliefs. What do you think is the correct outcome in this case?

>Several prominent federal judges, including Supreme Court Justices, recently have called for the Supreme Court to revise/reverse its famous *New York Times v. Sullivan* decision (1964), which makes it quite difficult for public officials/public figures to prevail in a defamation lawsuit. Could you discuss the pros and cons of the *Sullivan* defamation standards?

.....

Questions from my new book, *Free Speech: What Everyone Needs to Know*® (Oxford University Press 2023): The twelve most common, most challenging questions about/arguments against free speech

- 1) Isn't First Amendment law too rigidly absolute?
- 2) Even speech that doesn't satisfy the emergency standard ("non-emergency speech") could well be harmful, so why doesn't the First Amendment permit non-emergency speech restrictions?
- 3) Doesn't First Amendment law privilege free speech above equality rights?
- 4) Doesn't freedom of speech rest on the flawed assumption that words are harmless?
- 5) Doesn't freedom of speech rest on the false premise that the marketplace of ideas will lead to truth?
- 6) Isn't freedom of speech the tool of the powerful, not the powerless?
- 7) Isn't some speech tantamount to violence, and therefore subject to punishment, along with other forms of violence?
- 8) Hasn't freedom of speech become mostly a conservative talking point?
- 9) Doesn't Germany's experience, with the rise of Hitler and Nazism, show that we should censor hateful and extremist speech?

- 10) Aren't free speech defenders wrong when they claim that the best answer to harmful speech is "counterspeech"?
- 11) Shouldn't government have more power to restrict social media because of its unprecedented power to convey harmful speech?
- 12) Don't social media algorithms warrant more government restrictions because they manipulate people into "echo chambers" and "rabbit holes," thus undermining both liberty and democracy?

.....

Questions about hate speech – related to my 2018 book, *HATE: Why We Should Resist It with Free Speech, Not Censorship* (Oxford University Press 2018)

- 1) What is the legal definition of "hate speech"?
- 2) Why should we defend freedom even "for the thought that we hate"?
- 3) How can you, as the daughter of a Holocaust survivor, possibly defend free speech for neo Nazis and other racists? We often hear that the First Amendment protects "hate speech," but we also often hear that "hate speech is not free speech" under the First Amendment. Which, if either, of these statements is correct?
- 4) Is the U.S. an international outlier on these issues? How does the First Amendment law compare/contrast to international human rights law on point (under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights)?
- 5) Do you deny that "hate speech" causes harm, including psychological and emotional harm to its targets, as well as fostering discrimination and violence?
- 6) Many other countries have long enforced anti-"hate speech" laws, including Britain, Canada, Australia, and other democracies very similar to ours. Surely you're not contending that there isn't sufficiently robust free speech in these places, are you? Or that their democratic self-government is undermined?
- 7) How can you, as a privileged, well-educated white person, presume to tell members of vulnerable minority groups that they should have to endure being subjected to hateful, disparaging, dehumanizing expression?
- 8) You advocate "counterspeech" as an alternative to censorship. But isn't it unfair to expect targets of "hate speech" to have to bear this burden? Many of them may not have the education, or access to technology to effectively engage in counterspeech. And many may feel intimidated and chilled from speaking.

9) Isn't it true that Hitler rose to power in Germany because the Nazis' anti-Semitic and other "hate speech" fueled the spread of discrimination, violence, and ultimately genocide? Universities have no obligation to invite controversial speakers, do they? Why should they give a platform to hateful, hated views?

10) In a situation such as that faced by Berkeley, where demonstrators engaged in property damage and actual or threatened violence against people in connection with the scheduled speech by Milo Yiannopoulos in 2017, isn't there a justification for cancelling the speech?

11) Was the ACLU wrong to defend the free speech rights of the "Unite the Right" demonstrators in Charlottesville?

12) Was the ACLU wrong to subsequently state that it would no longer defend the free speech (or other) rights of demonstrators who are armed?

13) Why should the ACLU use its scarce resources to defend free speech (or other) rights of people who are using those rights to advocate hateful, discriminatory views and policies? Shouldn't it leave those cases to other lawyers and organizations?

14) Doesn't the rise of Donald Trump show that "hate speech" has adverse consequences?

15) Doesn't a private college or university have its own First Amendment rights to declare certain ideas off limits?

16) Don't the Internet and social media present unique new dangers from "hate speech," justifying online censorship of such speech, even if such censorship wouldn't be justified in traditional media? In the wake of rising "hate speech" and hate crimes in the recent past, online intermediaries have been increasingly denying their platforms and services to "hate speech." Specifically in the wake of Charlottesville, even Cloudflare, which had previously maintained a strict policy of not enforcing any such content limits, finally denied its services to a neo-Nazi website. In fact, online intermediaries have been criticized for not moving quickly or forcefully enough to deny their services to "hate speech" and other extremist, potentially dangerous, content. These questions/controversies continue to arise in the wake of continuing episodes of hateful, extremist violence, some of which were preceded by hateful online screeds. What do you think the online companies should do to monitor and remove "hate speech" and other extremist, potentially dangerous expression? When are you and the ACLU finally going to follow in the footsteps of the online companies, and deny your services to such abhorrent speech?

17) Since you oppose censoring "hate speech," what steps would you support to reduce the harms that "hate speech" potentially causes: psychic injury, discrimination, and violence? Are there such steps that you would recommend specifically in the campus context?

.....

Questions about the forthcoming reissued edition of my book, *Defending Pornography: Free Speech, Sex, and the Fight for Women’s Rights* (originally published by Scribner in 1995, to be republished for the NYU Classics Series on 3/5/24, with a new Preface)

What was the major theme of this book, and why has NYU Press decided that it is still relevant – indeed, worthy of “Classic” status?

Many books recently have been attacked as “pornography” or “obscenity” that should be removed from public and school libraries and school curricula – including even Art Spiegelman’s award-winning graphic novel about the Holocaust, *Maus*, and *The Diary of Anne Frank*. What are the applicable First Amendment principles?

The original edition of *Defending Pornography* responded to the then-dominant “radical feminist” view that sexually explicit expression that “demeans” or “degrades” women should be censored because it contributes to discrimination and violence against women. You explained the feminist anti-censorship view: that censoring sexual expression does more harm than good specifically to women’s rights, and also to the rights of LGBTQ+ people. How are these 20th-century debates among feminists relevant to today’s cultural and political debates?

Many of the recent efforts to limit sexually themed expression are aimed at protecting children, and also parents’ rights to make educational decisions on behalf of their children. Aren’t these sufficiently important concerns to justify at least some of the restrictions?

.....

Questions about free speech controversies in the wake of the October 7, 2023 Hamas terrorist attacks on Israel

1) Should even anti-Semitic speech, and speech advocating terrorism, be permitted? When does such expression cross the line between protected and punishable speech?

2) Even if anti-Semitic speech and speech advocating terrorism should be protected from government restrictions, shouldn’t employers have the right to refuse to hire students who have engaged in such speech, or to withdraw job offers? (As happened concerning law students at NYU and Harvard.) And even if employers have the right to do this, *should* they do so? Does penalizing such students constitute problematic cancel culture?

3) What about students who belong to student organizations that issue statements that are deemed anti-Semitic and/or pro-terrorist? For example, the 30 student organizations at Harvard? Should employers refuse to hire/fire them?

4) What about alleged “doxing” of individual students who issued or were otherwise associated with controversial statements? For example, sound trucks with the students’ names and faces displayed, driving/parking near campus?

5) Florida Governor Ron DeSantis called for the disbanding of campus chapters of Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP), and others – including some major Jewish organizations – have urged

university presidents to investigate their campus SJP chapters for potential violations of federal and state laws that bar “material support” for foreign terrorist organizations. Do these anti-SJP measures violate the First Amendment?

6) Given controversies about university Presidents’ statements about the terrorist attacks and Israel’s response, there has been increasing support for universities adopting positions of institutional neutrality, and hence not making statements about general political issues that don’t directly affect the university itself – along the lines of the 1967 Kalven Report adopted at the University of Chicago, as well as the Princeton Principles adopted in 2023. Do you endorse this approach?

7) Could you comment on some of the specific situations that have arisen, as to the free speech dimensions (given the constant stream of such incidents, this list is incomplete):

- A Resident Assistant in a dormitory at Wellesley College issuing an anti-Zionist statement.

- A faculty member at Stanford reportedly dividing students into Jewish, Palestinian, and other identity groups.

- A faculty member issuing a threatening statement against “Zionist journalists”

- A video appearing to show a Harvard student being surrounded and insulted by anti-Israel demonstrators

- A Cornell student who was arrested and is being subject to federal criminal prosecution for antisemitic, threatening online posts

- Columbia University’s suspension of two student organizations – SJP (Students for Justice in Palestine) and JVP (Jewish Voices for Peace) for allegedly violating regulations limiting campus demonstrations

- Students at NYU and elsewhere tearing down and/or defacing posters of Israeli hostages

- Students at Harvard and elsewhere occupying administrative offices

- Students at MIT and elsewhere shouting slogans about the Hamas-Israel conflict in class

8) Regarding the three university Presidents’ controversial answers to Congressional questioning about anti-semitic expression on their campuses on December 5, 2023....

- Weren’t the Presidents correct when they answered that whether speech “calling for the genocide of Jews” is/is not protected depends on the context?

- Were their answers problematic for other reasons?

- Were these hearings – including the aftermath, with two of the three Presidents having resigned (as of 1/4/24, when this question was written) – positive or negative for academic freedom/campus free speech?

9) What steps should higher education institutions take to reduce anti semitism, as well as other forms of bias, consistent with academic freedom/free speech?

Questions about academic freedom/free speech on campus generally

- 1) Do the First Amendment principles that apply in the community at large also apply on the campuses of public colleges and universities?
- 2) What about private colleges and universities; what obligations do they have to protect free speech rights of members of their communities?
- 3) Could you summarize the distinction between protected and unprotected speech in campus settings such as malls and quads (in other words, parts of the campus that are comparable to public parks – in contrast to, for example, classrooms or laboratories)?
- 4) Could you summarize the distinctive free speech regimes that govern other campus settings – other than malls and quads – for example, classrooms, libraries, and dormitories?
- 4) May faculty members be punished for controversial expression when they aren't acting specifically in their capacity as professors or scholars – for example, on social media or during demonstrations?
- 5) What is “academic freedom”? How does it differ from freedom of speech?
- 6) What steps should universities take to improve the state of academic freedom/free speech on their campuses?
- 7) What about government efforts that are undertaken for the stated purpose of protecting academic freedom – for example, Congressional hearings into the state of academic freedom on specific campuses, Congressional subpoenas of university documents concerning academic freedom, and executive orders requiring universities to take certain steps to protect academic freedom? Are these kinds of steps positive or negative in terms of academic freedom?
- 8) What is the relationship between academic freedom and diversity, equity and inclusion?
- 9) Consistent with faculty members' academic freedom, what limits – if any – may be imposed on what and how they teach? For example, may faculty members be barred from indoctrinating their students? May faculty members be required to expose their students to diverse viewpoints, and/or to permit students to express diverse viewpoints? May faculty members be barred from expressing their own viewpoints in their classroom/teaching capacity?
- 10) When faculty members express views outside the classroom – for example, in social media posts or podcast interviews – concerning matters such as race, ethnicity, or religion, which make certain students fear that the faculty member will discriminate against them in class, should the students have any remedy – for example, the right not to be enrolled in any class that professor teaches? (For example, what if a professor posts statements on social media about the Hamas-Israel conflict, which are generally critical of Israelis and Jews, or of Palestinians and Muslims, causing Israeli, Jewish, Palestinian, and/or Muslim students to fear discriminatory treatment?)

Questions about academic freedom/free speech at law schools in particular

1)What is the significance of new ABA Standard 208 (adopted in February 2024), requiring law schools to “adopt, publish, and adhere to written policies that protect academic freedom,” and that “encourage and support the free expression of ideas”?

2)What is the interrelationship between ABA Standard 208, and recent amendments to ABA Standards 303(b) and (c)(effective fall 2023), which respectively require law schools to “provide substantial opportunities to students for...the development of a professional identity,” and to educate students “on bias, cross-cultural competency, and racism”?

3)Concerning academic freedom matters – including exposure to ideas and expressions that students may well find offensive and upsetting – should the standards in law schools differ from those in higher education more generally? Law schools are training lawyers to carry out unique professional responsibilities in our system of law and justice; what impact does that have on these academic freedom issues?

4)Some law students, with support from some law professors, have maintained that they should not be required to read and/or discuss judicial opinions (or other materials) that contain racist epithets, or that contain racist ideas, such as the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* and *Plessy v. Ferguson*. What is your view?

Questions about free speech rights in public and school libraries

1)You have often spoken to librarians’ groups, including the American Library Association and state library associations, and you have explained why free speech rights in libraries are of special personal importance to you. Could you share that background with us?

2)And why are these rights of special importance to all individuals, and to our democracy?

3)What First Amendment standards govern removals of books from public and school libraries?

4)Many state and local governments are seeking to restrict certain materials from school and public libraries on the ground that they contain illegal sexual content, using terms such as “obscenity” and “pornography.” What sexual expression may government restrict, consistent with these concepts or any others? In particular, please explain the following concepts:

- a. Pornography
- b. Child pornography
- c. Obscenity
- d. Material that is “harmful to minors”

5)What steps can librarians and members of the public take to increase support for First Amendment rights in libraries?

Questions about minors’ free speech rights, including in public schools

1)What First Amendment rights do minors and school students have? Does government have special power to restrict these rights – more so than for older adults?

2)To what extent may schools restrict/punish student speech that occurs outside of school premises, and beyond school hours, on the rationale that the speech has an adverse impact on the school (for example, speech that critiques school officials or policies)?

3)To what extent may schools restrict/punish speech in student newspapers, theater productions, art exhibits, and other school-related student expression?

4)Regarding school curricula, what First Amendment standards govern the inclusion/exclusion of materials?

5)What First Amendment rights do K-12 teachers have?

6)A growing number of state and local governments have sought to impose age verification requirements for accessing social media and other online expression. Do these restrictions violate the First Amendment?

7) Do restrictions on minors' access to certain expressive materials violate the constitutional rights of their parents/guardians?