



FREEDOM TO READ FOUNDATION NEWS

50 EAST HURON STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 PHONE (312) 280-4226

www.ftrf.org • ftrf@ala.org • www.ftrf.org/ftrfnews.html

Judith F. Krug, Executive Director

John W. Berry, President

Vol. 31, No. 2–3

September 2006

Vamos a Cuba: FTRF files amicus in Miami case

On September 22, the Freedom to Read Foundation filed an *amicus* brief with the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals in the case ACLU of Florida v. Miami-Dade County School Board. Joining FTRF on the brief were the American Booksellers Foundation for Free Expression (ABFFE), the Association of American Publishers (AAP), the National Coalition Against Censorship, PEN/American Center, and REFORMA.

On June 14, the Miami/Dade County (Fla.) School Board voted 6–3 to remove the books *Vamos a Cuba* and *A Visit to Cuba* (its English translation), along with dozens of other books in the “Visit to...” series, from the shelves of the school district’s libraries. The removal took place after two review committees and the superintendent recommended retaining the books. The board said the book “is inaccurate and contains several omissions.”

Specifically, the Board felt the book didn’t accurately reflect the hardship of life under Castro’s regime. The “Visit to...” series aims to depict life in other countries. *Vamos a Cuba* became a central issue in the school board election held in September.

On June 21, the Greater Miami Chapter of the ACLU of Florida filed suit in the district court for the Southern Florida, and on July 24, Judge Alan Gold found in favor of the plaintiffs, ordering the school district to replace all the books.

Inside this issue of *FTRF News*...

- **FTRF announces organization category, p. 2**
- **FTRF Trustee election results, p. 2–3**
- **Caywood wins Roll of Honor Award, p. 4**
- **Report to ALA Council, p. 5–8**

CT John Does unmasked, NSL withdrawn

At a program during the American Library Association Annual Conference in New Orleans this summer, four librarians affiliated with The Library Consortium in Connecticut spoke of their experiences as the “John Does”—plaintiffs in a suit challenging the receipt of a National Security Letter (NSL). During the event, they made the dramatic revelation that, in addition to the gag order having been lifted, the federal government that day had withdrawn the NSL, thus effectively ending the case.

The four John Does are:

- **Barbara Bailey**, Director, Welles-Turner Memorial Library, Glastonbury and President, Library Connection, Inc.
- **Peter Chase**, Director, Plainville Public Library and Vice President, Library Connection, Inc.
- **George Christian**, Executive Director, Library Connection, Inc., and
- **Janet Nocek**, Director, Portland Library and Secretary, Library Connection, Inc.

Among the issues the librarians discussed were the stress of being unable to reveal their involvement in the case to their colleagues, friends, and families; the frustration of their inability to participate in the public debate regarding the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act; and the absurdity of whom they could be seen with, and whom they could talk to during the legal proceeding, even after having been identified by national media publications (due to an error by the federal government). They also spoke eloquently about the importance of what they were doing, and thanked those who supported them during their ordeal.

Continued on p. 2

Continued from p. 1

Their written statements and video from the press conference following the lifting of the gag order can be found at <http://www.aclu.org/safefree/nationalsecurityletters/>. For background information, visit <http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/ifissues/usactlibrarians.htm>.

New York NSL case ongoing; FTRF and ALA to file another *amicus*

While the Connecticut case was mooted by the government's decision to void its request for records, its sister case continued in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. The appeal of Judge Marrero's decision to strike down the NSL provision of the USA PATRIOT Act, which stemmed from a case in New York, had been combined with the Connecticut case. Parties on both sides had filed briefs with the Second Circuit and a trial was pending, but in the wake of some changes to the federal statute when the PATRIOT Act was reauthorized, the appellate court ordered the case remanded to Judge Marrero.

The ACLU filed an amended complaint this summer. The Freedom to Read Foundation will join with ALA, AAP, and ABFFE to file another *amicus* brief in the coming weeks.

The case is [Doe v. Gonzales](#).

New category for FTRF organizational members

As part of its effort to meet increasing challenges to intellectual freedom, the Freedom to Read Foundation has established an organizational membership category. This new dues structure offers libraries, businesses, and nonprofits a greater opportunity to support librarians around the United States besieged by attempts to restrict access to library materials and services. The Foundation is simultaneously engaging in a membership recruitment campaign intended to significantly increase its overall base of support.

FTRF president John W. Berry said, "In the wake of high-profile cases like the Communications Decency Act and the Children's Internet Protection Act, it is

clear that the Freedom to Read Foundation must build on our ability to respond rapidly to challenges to the freedom of expression and access to information. We invite those institutions that share our passion for these freedoms to be a part of our growth. We want to be prepared when the next big case hits."

Berry observed that no organization has done more to defend and advance the First Amendment in libraries than FTRF. At the same time, a surprising number of librarians and other free speech supporters don't know about the remarkable successes the Foundation has had since its inception in 1969. FTRF has played a crucial role in cases that have kept books on library shelves and in schools; affirmed the privacy rights of library patrons and bookstore customers; and recognized the freedom to communicate online.

Starting September 1, 2006, organizations that join or renew their FTRF memberships can do so at a minimum level of \$100 annually. Additional organizational membership levels are \$250, \$500, and \$1,000 per year. Personal memberships will continue at \$35 per year for regular members, \$50 for contributing members, \$100 for sponsors, \$500 for patrons, and \$1,000 for benefactors. Membership includes a subscription to the Freedom to Read Foundation quarterly newsletter and a vote in the annual FTRF Trustee election.

FTRF election results

In the April election, five Trustees were elected to the Freedom to Read Foundation Board:

Francis J. Buckley (re-elected)
Arlington, VA

Chris Finan (re-elected)
American Booksellers Foundation for Free Expression
New York, NY

Deborah Jacobs (re-elected)
Seattle Public Library
Seattle, WA

Burton Joseph
Joseph, Lichtenstein, & Levinson
Chicago, IL

Candace Morgan (re-elected)
Portland, OR

The newly elected Trustees join the following members to form the FTRF Board for 2006–2007:

John W. Berry
Therese Bigelow
Jonathan Bloom
Anne Heanue
James G. Neal
Judith Platt

Ex Officio

Leslie Burger	ALA President
Loriene Roy	ALA President Elect
Kenton Oliver	IFC Chair
Keith Michael Fiels	ALA Executive Director

At the Annual Meeting in New Orleans, Berry was re-elected President, Morgan was re-elected Vice President, and Jacobs was re-elected Treasurer. Bigelow and Joseph were named to the Executive Committee. Executive Director Judith Krug serves as Secretary of the Board.

If you are a member of the Freedom to Read Foundation and are interested in running for election to the Board of Trustees, please contact Francis Buckley chair of the Nominating Committee, at francisjbuckley@aol.com.

Thanks to everyone who participated in this election, both candidates and voters!

DOPA passes House

On July 26, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Deleting Online Predators Act (DOPA) 410–15. The bill would force libraries and schools that accept federal “universal service support” to ban access to “commercial social networking websites and chat rooms.”

The intellectual freedom implications of this legislation are significant: Congress would use its funding power to bar access in public libraries to legal information. Moreover, it ignores the fact that such websites are used for a multiplicity of educational, political, and artistic purposes. The legislation is vague enough that it could encompass blogs, wikis, photo-sharing sites, and other interactive web applications. Many libraries themselves have profiles on places like MySpace and Flickr.

The bill has been referred to the Senate. The American Library Association is urging all concerned people to contact their Senators and explain the importance of interactive web applications in general and social networking sites in particular. For more information, visit:

- <http://wikis.ala.org/socialnetworking/>
- <http://teentechweek.wikispaces.com/DOPA>
- <http://tinyurl.com/14ww6>

Updates

Supreme Court decision in Beard v. Banks

On June 28, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned a Third Circuit Court of Appeals decision that would have struck down a Pennsylvania prison rule restricting inmates’ access to all secular newspapers and most other reading materials based on their behavior. FTRF joined the *Prison Legal News*, Reporters Committee for a Free Press, ABFFE, AAP, and the Publishers Marketing Association in filing an *amicus* brief in support of the prisoners in this case. The brief argued that the prison’s policy impermissibly infringes on the First Amendment right of the prisoners to obtain information and the First Amendment right of publishers and writers to freely disseminate their works to every person. Further, the policy unconstitutionally favored religious publications over secular ones.

In his majority decision upholding the rule, Justice Stephen Breyer did leave the door open to future challenges to the prison restrictions.

Forensic Advisors v. Matrixx decision

The Maryland Court of Special Appeals decided on September 19 to allow the company Matrixx Initiatives to go forward with its deposition against Timothy Mulligan and his company, Forensic Advisors, in a case in which FTRF joined Public Citizen, ABFFE, AAP, and several other organizations

in submitting an *amicus* brief. The decision did not address FTRF's claim that Matrixx's attempt to gain access to Forensic Advisors' list of newsletter subscribers violated the First Amendment right to receive information anonymously. However, the court did hold that a financial newsletter qualified as "news media" and that Mulligan may assert Maryland's media privilege to refuse to answer questions about the identities of his sources.

The case involves *The Eyeshade Report*, a newsletter published by Mulligan, that published a report critical of Matrixx, the producer of Zicam cold remedies. Matrixx filed suit in Arizona against online commenters who were critical of the company, and the company claimed that the *Eyeshade* report contained comments that bore a "striking resemblance" to the anonymous critics. An Arizona court authorized subpoenas to compel Mulligan (in Maryland) to give a deposition and to gain access to Forensic Advisors' subscriber list in order to try to discover who made the critical remarks. Mulligan asked a Maryland district court to quash the subpoenas but the court refused to do so, thus leading to the appeal.

The deposition is now scheduled to go forward with the understanding that Mulligan may assert media privilege.

Other News

Caywood presented with Roll of Honor Award

Carolyn Caywood, manager of the Virginia Beach Public Library's Bayside Area Library and Special Services Library for the Blind & Physically Handicapped, is the recipient of the 2006 Freedom to Read Foundation Roll of Honor Award. ALA President Michael Gorman presented her with the award at the ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans during the Opening General Session. The text of the citation reads:

Thank you, Carolyn Caywood, for your years of exemplary service to the Freedom to Read Foundation—as a Trustee, as a generous donor, as a two-decade member, and as a vigorous promoter of the Foundation to your friends, colleagues, and speaking audiences.

Thank you, Carolyn, for your leadership on intellectual freedom issues in Virginia and nationally. From chairing the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the Virginia Library Association and the Intellectual Freedom Round Table of the American Library Association; to testifying before the U.S. Congress regarding the Child Online Protection Act and Children's Internet Protection Act; to co-founding Virginians Against Censorship; you have been a stalwart advocate for the principles on which the Freedom to Read Foundation is based.

Thank you for your dedication to libraries, librarians, and library users. You understand the profound interconnection between access to information and freedom, and in your writing, speaking, and policy-making, you unfailingly promote librarianship as the bastion of our democracy.

Thank you, Carolyn, for your work with young people, for understanding that it is vital to give young people the tools to become active learners, and that censorship serves to disempower them. You put your beliefs into action by creating the Bayside Youth Commission, the first teen advisory group in the Virginia Beach Public Library system.

Thank you, Carolyn Caywood, for benefiting all librarians by contributing your intelligence, your passion, your experience, and your humor to the defense of the First Amendment for us all.

John W. Berry Judith F. Krug
President Executive Director

New Orleans, Louisiana
June 2006



FTRF President John W. Berry and Roll of Honor Award recipient Carolyn Caywood

Notes:

PLA's Conable Award: The Public Library Association has established the Gordon M. Conable Award, which "honors a public library staff member, a library trustee, or a public library, that has demonstrated a commitment to intellectual freedom and the *Library Bill of Rights*. The award consists of \$1,500 and a plaque to be presented annually at the ALA Annual Conference." The award is sponsored by LSSI, which was Conable's employer at the time of his death. The deadline for the 2007 award is December 1, 2006. For more information, visit PLA's Awards Online Application at <https://cs.ala.org/PLA/pLAAWARDS/login.cfm> ... **FTRF wins IVI/IPO Legal Eagle award:** The Freedom to Read Foundation was this year's recipient of the Independent Voters of Illinois-Independent Precinct Organization's "Legal Eagle Award." President John W. Berry accepted the award at the organization's annual banquet in June.

Report to Council

2006 Annual Conference New Orleans, Louisiana

The Freedom to Read Foundation reports to the ALA Council at each Annual Conference and Midwinter Meeting. The following is an edited version of the report presented at the 2006 Annual Conference in New Orleans.

As President of the Freedom to Read Foundation, I am pleased to report on the Foundation's activities since the 2006 Midwinter Meeting.

MEETING "JOHN DOE"

For the past year, the Freedom to Read Foundation provided critical legal support to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) in its representation of "John Doe," the Connecticut librarian(s) and member(s) of the American Library Association challenging the constitutionality of the National Security Letter (NSL) provision of Section 505 of the USA PATRIOT Act. The NSL was served on "John Doe" last summer. When the ACLU decided to mount a direct challenge to the gag order imposed upon "John Doe," FTRF's counsel, Theresa Chmara, authored *amicus curiae*

briefs that eloquently argued for Doe’s First Amendment right to speak out about his/her/their experience during the ongoing debate on the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act. Even though the ACLU won an order lifting the gag order, government appeals kept the gag order in place and prevented “John Doe” from being heard when Doe would have provided crucial information about the NSL’s chilling effect on constitutional rights.

Only after Congress voted in March to reauthorize the USA PATRIOT Act did the government withdraw its objections to lifting the gag order, allowing us to meet for the first time the four courageous and principled librarians who collectively were “John Doe”: George Christian, Executive Director of Library Connection, a computer consortium serving many Connecticut libraries; Barbara Bailey, President of Library Connection’s Board of Directors; Vice President Peter Chase; and Janet Nocek, Board Secretary.

The Foundation worked closely with the ACLU over the past eight months, providing legal support for the four librarians. On May 24, 2006, the Second Circuit dismissed the government’s appeal and remanded the case back to the lower courts after the government informed the court that it no longer opposed the four librarians’ decision to reveal their identities.

Yesterday, June 26, at a terrific forum moderated by ALA President Michael Gorman, the four Does introduced themselves and discussed the personal and professional impact of having been served an NSL and being bound by the gag order. They also made the announcement, for the first time, that the federal government had withdrawn its request to seek the records. This meant that the case, Doe v. Gonzales (Connecticut), is now effectively mooted. The gag order, which had been partially lifted, is now fully lifted. We are still waiting to see what court documents will remain under seal and for how long.

[Update: On August 3, the ACLU, following an order from Justice Ginsburg that the court documents be unsealed, posted them on its website. They also posted the National Security Letter served to The Library Connection.]

Peter Chase is an old friend to the Freedom to Read Foundation and a longtime champion of intellectual freedom, including serving as the Intellectual Freedom Committee chair for the Connecticut Library Associa-

tion. Speaking afterwards about his experience, he told the press, “As a librarian, I believe it is my duty and responsibility to speak out about any infringement to the intellectual freedom of library patrons.”

The Foundation salutes Peter, Barbara, George, and Janet for their principled stance. Their counsel—that we have a duty to speak out about efforts to infringe upon our freedom—is counsel we can all take to heart, as those who would eviscerate our library collections and open library records to government surveillance continue to threaten our right to read freely. FTRF will continue to stand firm and speak out against those efforts.

There remains an ongoing case challenging the NSL: Doe v. Gonzales (New York). As you recall, Judge Marrero of the Southern District of New York issued an order in September 2004 that struck down the NSL statute, ruling that the FBI’s power to issue a NSL without judicial review and under a seal of absolute secrecy violated the Constitution. The appellate court instructed Judge Marrero to reconsider his decision in light of the changes made to the NSL statutes by the legislation reauthorizing the USA PATRIOT Act. FTRF will continue to support the plaintiff and the ACLU in their efforts to challenge the use of NSLs. Notably, Second Circuit Judge Richard Cardamone took issue with the government’s claim that a permanent ban on speech is sometimes permissible under the First Amendment. In his concurring opinion, he said “a perpetual gag on citizen speech of the type advocated so strenuously by the government may likely be unconstitutional.”

DEFENDING THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND THE RIGHT TO READ FREELY

The Freedom to Read Foundation’s newest legal action, Beard v. Banks, seeks to vindicate the rights of prisoners to receive information behind prison walls. *See update on page 3.*

I am happy to report a successful result in Lyle v. Warner Brothers Television Productions, a court case filed by a writers’ assistant for the Friends television show. The plaintiff claimed that the banter and sexual jokes the show’s writers engaged in during meetings subjected her to a hostile work environment, even though none of the banter or jokes were directed at her. An intermediate California appellate court ruled that unless the production company demonstrated that

the conversations were “necessary to the creative process,” the comments could support a hostile work environment claim. On April 20, 2006, the California Supreme Court overturned the intermediate court’s decision, finding that the writers’ comments were not sufficiently severe or pervasive enough to support a hostile work environment claim. FTRF joined with ABFFE, AAP, Comic Book Legal Defense Fund (CBLDF), and PMA, the Independent Book Publishers Association, to file an *amicus curiae* brief in support of the show’s producers. The brief argued that the “creative necessity” test eliminated crucial First Amendment protections that bar government intrusion into the creative and editorial process.

FTRF has joined with other members of the Media Coalition to file an *amicus* brief in support of the plaintiffs in Entertainment Software Association v. Blagojevich, a lawsuit seeking to enjoin enforcement of two new Illinois laws limiting the sale and rental of violent and sexually explicit computer and video games to minors and requiring retailers to post in-store signs informing customers about the Entertainment Software Rating Board’s rating system. After the federal district court enjoined enforcement of the laws, the Illinois attorney general filed an appeal with respect to the sexually explicit video game law before the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. It did not challenge the ruling on the violent video game law. The FTRF *amicus* brief, filed on April 7, 2006, in support of the Entertainment Software Association, argues that the law’s provisions violate the First Amendment.

FTRF also pursues actions to vindicate the public’s right to access government records and information. In this vein, FTRF joined with several other organizations in 2002 to file an *amicus* brief in American Historical Association v. National Archives and Records Administration, a challenge to the legality of Executive Order No. 13233, signed into law by President Bush on November 1, 2001. The order claims to establish procedures for implementing the Presidential Records Act of 1978 (PRA) but instead imposes restrictions that threaten the timely release of presidential and vice-presidential records in accordance with the PRA. Plaintiffs bringing the action included the American Historical Association, the National Security Archives, Public Citizen, and the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press. After the release of many records, the suit was dismissed in 2004 without a ruling on the legality of the executive order. However, because some records had not been released from

President Reagan’s records and a controversy had arisen over newly asserted privileges raised by President George W. Bush, the plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on November 30, 2005, challenging the legality of the order. FTRF and our fellow *amici* filed a revised version of our brief the same day. A motion for summary judgment is pending before the court.

The Foundation is also participating in the following First Amendment actions:

Gonzales v. American Civil Liberties Union (formerly Ashcroft v. ACLU): After the Supreme Court issued an opinion upholding the injunction barring enforcement of the Children’s Online Protection Act (COPA) in June 2004, it returned the lawsuit to the federal district court in Philadelphia for a trial to determine whether COPA’s “harmful to minors” restrictions are the least restrictive means of achieving the government’s goal of protecting children from seeing sexually explicit materials online. The parties continue to pursue discovery in preparation for an anticipated trial date of October 2006.

Chiras v. Miller: Author Daniel Chiras and a group of parents and students filed this class-action lawsuit against the Texas State Board of Education after the Board voted to reject Chiras’ textbook *Environmental Science: Creating a Sustainable Future for Texas* high-school environmental science classes because it believed the textbook was “anti-Christian” and “anti-free enterprise.” This past December, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the district court’s decision to dismiss the lawsuit, agreeing that school boards may reject textbooks if they disagree with the author’s viewpoint when such “viewpoint discrimination” is “reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical concerns.” The plaintiffs decided not to seek *certiorari* with the U.S. Supreme Court, bringing this case to a close.

Yahoo! v. La Ligue Contre Le Racisme et L’Antisemitisme (LICRA): This is the suit challenging the penalties threatened by the courts in France after Yahoo! allowed Nazi-related book excerpts and auction items to be posted to its U.S. websites. Such postings violate French law but are fully protected speech under the American First Amendment. Two French groups, La Ligue Contre Le Racisme et L’Antisemitisme and the French Union of Jewish Students, initiated the legal action against

Yahoo! in France and won the initial lawsuit. Yahoo! then filed suit in the United States to obtain a ruling on the validity of the French court's order in light of its users' First Amendment rights.

FTRF submitted an *amicus* brief in support of Yahoo!'s legal action seeking a declaratory judgment barring enforcement of the French judgment in the United States. The district court in California ruled in favor of Yahoo!, but a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed, holding that the district court lacked jurisdiction over the French defendants. Yahoo! subsequently petitioned the Ninth Circuit for a rehearing en banc, and FTRF joined another *amicus* brief supporting Yahoo!'s petition. The Ninth Circuit granted the petition and following oral argument, upheld the decision dismissing the suit.

On April 10, 2006, Yahoo! filed a petition for *certiorari* with the U.S. Supreme Court, seeking review of the Ninth Circuit's decision, but the Supreme Court denied *certiorari* last month. The Supreme Court's decision concludes this case without any final determination of whether a foreign government's court order can be enforced in the United States against a U.S. person for publishing materials on the Internet that are legal in the United States.

THE FREEDOM TO READ: STATE INTERNET CONTENT LAWS

The Freedom to Read Foundation continues to participate as a plaintiff in lawsuits challenging state laws that criminalize the distribution of Internet content deemed "harmful to minors," to assure that those using the Internet continue to enjoy their full First Amendment rights and retain the right to determine for themselves what they read and view on the Internet.

The lawsuit we are pursuing most vigorously is The King's English v. Shurtleff, our challenge to the Utah statute extending the state's "harmful to minors" prohibitions to the Internet. Among its most problematic provisions are sections requiring the creation of an Adult Content Registry for websites, requirements that Internet service providers block the websites listed in the registry, and a requirement that content providers evaluate and label content as "harmful to minors." The state's motion to dismiss all but three of the plaintiffs remains pending before the federal district court in Utah; the court refrained from ruling after representatives of the Utah legislature agreed to consider amending the legislation. The proposed bill did not pass, and the court has entered an order scheduling a trial date in January 2007. An

order barring enforcement of the statute remains in effect.

FTRF joined with ABFFE, AAP, CBLDF, the ACLU of Utah, and several Utah bookstores, Internet providers, and residents to bring this lawsuit.

[Update: On August 25, 2006, Judge Dee Benson issued a preliminary injunction blocking enforcement of the statute with the understanding that there will be an additional attempt to amend the law's language in the 2007 legislative session. Previously, the plaintiffs and defendants had an agreement not to enforce the law.]

ABFFE v. Petro (formerly Bookfriends, Inc. v. Taft), a challenge to the Ohio obscenity statute and "harmful to minors" law addressing both print materials and Internet content, remains pending before the federal district court in Ohio. In September 2004, Judge Walter Rice sustained in part and overruled in part both plaintiffs' and defendants' motions for summary judgment. The parties are still waiting for an expanded opinion to learn the specifics of the ruling.

DEFENDING PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

In addition to the two *Doe v. Gonzales* cases mentioned at the beginning of this report, FTRF is involved in other litigation involving privacy and confidentiality.

We patiently await a decision in Muslim Community Association of Ann Arbor v. Ashcroft, the facial legal challenge to Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, which amends the business records provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to permit FBI agents to obtain all types of records—including library records—without a showing of probable cause. The district court in Michigan heard oral arguments on the government's motion to dismiss the plaintiffs' complaint in December 2003. There is no indication when a decision will be forthcoming.

FTRF has joined with Public Citizen to file an *amicus* brief supporting the right to read anonymously in the legal action entitled Forensic Advisors, Inc. v. Matrixx Initiatives, Inc. *See update on page 3-4.*

STATE LEGISLATION

This year we saw an increase in mini-CIPA legislation on the state level, tying filtering to funding of libraries.

In Kansas, the legislature tried to pass a law that would remove sales tax exemptions from friends groups affiliated with libraries that did not have Internet filters. In Oklahoma, a bill was introduced to withdraw funding from any library that did not create a special "adults-only" section for "homosexually themed" and "sexually explicit" material. Neither bill passed. However, video games remain the most popular target of those who would restrict access to protected materials on the state level. In addition to the Illinois case discussed above, litigation was filed last week in Louisiana against a similar law.

FUNDRAISING

Following our very successful fundraiser with Sandra Cisneros in San Antonio, we are scheduled to have a reading and book signing at Seattle's Midwinter Meeting featuring Washington state's very own young-adult author, Chris Crutcher, author of a number of banned and challenged books, including *Athletic Shorts* and *Whale Talk*. Please keep your eyes open for more information about this exciting program.

The Board also amended our Constitution and Bylaws at this conference incorporating several changes recommended by ALA's Parliamentarian, Eli Mina.

We encourage all of our colleagues and friends to become members of the Freedom to Read Foundation.

Please send a check to Freedom to Read Foundation, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611.

You can also use a credit card to join the Foundation. Call (800) 545-2433 ext. 4226 or visit us online at www.ftrf.org to use our online donation form.

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Berry
President, Freedom to Read Foundation

Freedom to Read Foundation News (ISSN 0046-5038) is issued quarterly to all members of FTRF. Regular membership in the Freedom to Read Foundation begins at \$35.00 per year for individuals and \$100.00 per year for organizations. Student membership is \$10.00 annually. Contributions to the Foundation should be sent to: Freedom to Read Foundation, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. You also can contribute by phone at (800) 545-2433 x4226 or at www.ftrf.org/joinftrf.html. All contributions are tax-deductible.

The Freedom to Read Foundation is a First Amendment legal organization affiliated with the American Library

Association.