Topic: Amendment I
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.

Thesis Statement: While some believe free speech is a fundamental right to enjoy, others believe it violates their right to happiness.

Annotated Bibliography

Political:
This case is relevant, because while “fuck” is an expletive and considered provocative in nature, it was not directed towards anyone, and was absent evidence of intent to provoke physical action in others. Thus, protected by the First Amendment.

Profanity:
Vulgar and profanity-laced lyrics are often used as a cop out for First Amendment Protection. In recent years, threats against police officers have increased in musical lyrics. While few of these artist find themselves in a courtroom, most are protected.
Why are offensive lyrics protected when they clearly create more than an undertone of disparage and violence?
Hate Speech:

Hyun, E., & Zimmerman, S. Hate speech creates fear. *USA Today*, from
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The idea of free speech has drifted far away from its original intentions. Today, it is used to defend actions and events such as the college fraternal party written in this article, and less to to defend political and minority oppositions. The authors state a systemic problem within there university in regards to the First Amendment.

Flag Desecration:


Freedom of speech protects actions society may find very offensive, but society’s outrage alone is not justification for suppressing free speech. *Texas v. Johnson* 491 US 397 (1989). Burning, or otherwise desecrating the US flag, is protected under the First Amendment as symbolic, nonverbal speech.

Stolen Valor:


*United States v. Alvarez* 567 US ___ (2012) was a case where the Supreme Court’s ruling struck down the Stolen Valor Act. The Stolen Valor Act criminalizes false claims of
military service and medals received. Xavier Alvarez claimed he earned the
Congressional Medal of Honor; however, in fact, not only had he not earned such medal,
he had never served in the armed forces. Even though Mr. Alvarez's charges were
reversed under the Stolen Valor Act, he remained imprisoned for various fraud charges.
This is significant, because the Stolen Valor Act now criminalizes false claims of
receiving certain combat medals for the intention of receiving tangible benefits.