



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. 32, No. 1-2

May 2007

FTRF files *amicus* in “Bong Hits 4 Jesus” case

On February 20, the Freedom to Read Foundation joined four other free expression organizations in filing one of several *amicus* briefs with the U.S. Supreme Court in Morse v. Frederick, a case with significant implications for the First Amendment rights of students.

The case involves an 18-year-old high-school senior who was suspended for 10 days for carrying a sign reading “Bong Hits 4 Jesus” during an Olympic Torch Relay across the street from his Juneau, Alaska, school. After an unsuccessful appeal of the suspension to the school board, the student, Joseph Frederick, filed suit in federal court. The District Court held in favor of the school board but on appeal, the Ninth Circuit unanimously reversed, saying the school district had unconstitutionally limited Frederick’s freedom of expression. The school district then appealed that decision to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Freedom to Read Foundation joined with the Student Press Law Center, Feminists for Free Expression, the First Amendment Project, and the Thomas Jefferson Center for the Protection of Free Expression in filing its brief, which can be found at http://www.splc.org/pdf/morse/brief_splc.pdf.

The brief argues that (1) Frederick’s speech was not school speech, as it was made at a public event, outside a school environment, and thus his expression rights should have the same protection as any other citizens’ and (2) even if it could be considered “school speech,” Frederick’s banner fell within the rights students have for expressive activities under established legal precedent.

Several conservative religious organizations filed briefs also supporting Frederick, as did the American Booksellers Foundation for Free Expression and the National Coalition Against Censorship. Among those filing in support of the school district were the National School Boards Association, the Drug Free America Foundation, and the Bush Administration.

The case was heard by the U.S. Supreme Court on March 19. During oral argument, attorney for the school district, Kenneth Starr, argued that the principal was acting in accord with the school’s anti-drug mission. The attorney for Frederick argued, “This is a case about free speech, not drugs.” A decision is expected this summer.

Inside this issue of *FTRF News*...

- FTRF Trustee election results, p. 2
- FTRF joins brief in Atkins diet case, p. 3
- Report to ALA Council, p. 4-8
- Photos from Crutcher fundraiser, p. 8

Lucille Thomas to Receive Roll of Honor Award

Dr. Lucille C. Thomas, president of the Board of Trustees of the Brooklyn Public Library, has been named the recipient of the Freedom to Read Foundation Roll of Honor Award for 2007. The award will be presented on June 23 at the American Library Association’s Annual Conference in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Thomas’ efforts in support of intellectual freedom stem from her many years as a librarian with the New York City Board of Education. From there, she rose to become a supervisor, and, eventually, Director of the New York City Board of Education. Among her countless honors is ALA’s Honorary Membership, given to her in 2002. Dr. Thomas currently is a trustee with the LeRoy C. Merritt Humanitarian Fund.

The FTRF Roll of Honor was established in 1987 to recognize and honor those individuals who have contributed substantially to FTRF through adherence to its principles and/or substantial monetary support.

FTRF election results

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

Bernadine Abbott Hoduski

Helena, MT

Therese Bigelow (re-elected)

Kansas City Public Library
Kansas City, MO

Robert P. Doyle

Illinois Library Association
Chicago, IL

John K. Horany

John K. Horany, P.C.
Dallas, TX

James G. Neal (re-elected)

Columbia University
New York, NY

Judith Platt (re-elected)

Association of American Publishers
Washington, DC

The newly elected Trustees join the following members to form the FTRF Board for 2007-2008:

Francis Buckley

Chris Finan

Deborah Jacobs

Burton Joseph

Candace D. Morgan

Ex Officio

James Rettig ALA President-Elect

Loriene Roy ALA President

Kenton Oliver IFC Chair

Keith Michael Fiels ALA Executive Director

The FTRF officers will be elected at the Annual Conference in Washington, D.C. Executive Director Judith Krug serves as Secretary of the Board.

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

FTRF Organizational Memberships

by Anne Heanue, FTRF Trustee

Most of you reading this newsletter are already members and supporters of the Freedom to Read Foundation. You can contribute further to the Foundation's work by having your library or business join FTRF. There is a new membership category for organizations to encourage them to help protect the right to read.

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. 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, \$1,000 for benefactors, and \$10 for students. Membership includes a subscription to the Freedom to Read Foundation quarterly newsletter and a vote in the annual FTRF trustee election.

FTRF president John W. Berry has observed that no organization has done more to defend and advance the First Amendment in libraries than the Freedom to Read Foundation. 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.

To download our organizational membership brochure, visit <http://www.ftrf.org>. You also can donate online at that location. For additional information, call (800) 545-2433 x 4226 or e-mail ftrf@ala.org.

See p. 8 for photos from FTRF's second annual Banned Author fundraiser, featuring Chris Crutcher. To hear the podcast of Chris' talk, visit <http://www.ftrf.org> and click on "Chris Crutcher Podcast"

New Litigation

FTRF files *amicus* brief in Atkins publishing case

On April 10, the Freedom to Read Foundation joined the Association of American Publishers and the American Booksellers Foundation for Free Expression in filing an *amicus* brief in the case Gorran v. Atkins.

Gorran v. Atkins is the appeal by a disgruntled former Atkins dieter of the ruling by Judge Denny Chin of the Southern District of New York that dismissed his negligent misrepresentation, product liability, and state unfair competition claims. Gorran alleged that the best-selling book *Dr. Atkins' New Diet Revolution* and the Atkins Nutritionals, Inc. Web site made the false and misleading claims that the high-fat, low-carbohydrate Atkins nutritional approach is “safe for everyone” and “fool-proof.” In order to skirt the large body of law rejecting similar efforts to hold the authors of diet and other advice books liable for harm suffered by readers, Gorran larded his complaint with allegations relating to the Atkins business, which includes a variety of Atkins-branded products, to support his contention that the book and comparable portions of the Atkins Web site are commercial speech—promotion of the “Atkins Business”—and, therefore, not entitled to First Amendment protection.

The district court, ruling on Atkins' motion for judgment on the pleadings, dismissed the product liability claim on the grounds that the content of a book is not a product and the negligent misrepresentation claim on the ground that the author of a book owes no duty of care to his readers and that the Atkins diet advice consists of ideas and information that is fully protected by the First Amendment. The court dismissed the Florida unfair competition claim on the grounds that personal injuries are not cognizable and that the Atkins materials are protected by the First Amendment.

On appeal, Gorran presses only the unfair competition claim, which he argues should not have been dismissed prior to discovery into Atkins' business activities that would, demonstrate that the book and the Web site are commercial speech intended to promote the sale of Atkins-branded products.

The *amicus* brief, filed April 10, argues that the Atkins materials are entitled to unqualified First Amendment protection, as they are not commercial speech. It highlights the “marketplace of ideas” concept embedded in First Amendment jurisprudence and points out that the Atkins materials are contributions to an important, ongoing debate concerning diet and nutrition against the backdrop of an obesity epidemic. It will explain that holding these materials to be commercial speech would be unprecedented and would be a checkered flag for activists to target speech that offends their agendas. Such a ruling, the brief will explain, would send shock waves throughout the publishing world and would chill publications on debated topics of public importance, contrary to the purpose of the First Amendment.

The brief, written by FTRF Trustee (and AAP General Counsel) Jonathan Bloom, can be found on the FTRF Web site at: <http://www.ala.org/ftrfcases.html> (under Gorran v. Atkins).

Updates

Judge strikes down COPA

On March 22, U.S. District Judge Lowell Reed ruled that the Child Online Protection Act (COPA), passed in 1998, was unconstitutional. This is the latest setback to COPA, which first was enjoined in 1998, and which has been found unconstitutional twice by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Both times the case has reached the Supreme Court, however, it has been remanded—in this case, to find more information on the effectiveness of filters. Judge Reed determined that, for the purposes that COPA is attempting to achieve, filters were effective in providing a less restrictive alternative to criminalizing online content.

COPA would criminalize the distribution of material deemed “harmful to minors.” The Freedom to Read Foundation has participated in *amicus* briefs at all levels of the litigation surrounding the law, arguing at each step that the law impermissibly restricts freedom of expression, and is overbroad in its definition of material that could be considered “harmful to minors.”

The federal government currently is considering whether to appeal Judge Reed's decision.

Other News

Top 10 banned books of 2006

The ALA Office for Intellectual Freedom has announced the list of the ten most frequently challenged books of 2006, based on the reports it received. They are:

- “And Tango Makes Three” by Justin Richardson and Peter Parnell, for homosexuality, anti-family, and unsuited to age group;
- “Gossip Girls” series by Cecily Von Ziegesar for homosexuality, sexual content, drugs, unsuited to age group, and offensive language;
- “Alice” series by Phyllis Reynolds Naylor for sexual content and offensive language;
- “The Earth, My Butt, and Other Big Round Things” by Carolyn Mackler for sexual content, anti-family, offensive language, and unsuited to age group;
- “The Bluest Eye” by Toni Morrison for sexual content, offensive language, and unsuited to age group;
- “Scary Stories” series by Alvin Schwartz for occult/Satanism, unsuited to age group, violence, and insensitivity;
- “Athletic Shorts” by Chris Crutcher for homosexuality and offensive language;
- “The Perks of Being a Wallflower” by Stephen Chbosky for homosexuality, sexually explicit, offensive language, and unsuited to age group;
- “Beloved” by Toni Morrison for offensive language, sexual content, and unsuited to age group; and
- “The Chocolate War” by Robert Cormier for sexual content, offensive language, and violence.

OIF received a total of 546 challenges last year.

Downs Award to Reutty

Michelle Reutty, the New Jersey librarian who found herself embroiled in controversy after following correct procedure by requiring police to produce a subpoena for library records, was awarded the 2006 Robert B. Downs Intellectual Freedom Award. The award, sponsored by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Graduate School of Library and Information Science, was presented at the 2007 American Library Association

Midwinter Meeting in Seattle. The Downs Award includes an honorarium, provided by Greenwood Publishing Group.

Following an ongoing dispute with the Hasbrouck Heights Public Library’s board over her actions, Reutty resigned in October and has since become director of the Free Public Library in Oakland, N.J.



From L: Terry Weech, GSLIS; Michelle Reutty; Laura Mullen, Publicity Director, Greenwood Publishing Group.

Report to Council

2007 Midwinter Meeting Seattle, WA

The Freedom to Read Foundation reports to the ALA Council at each Annual Conference and Midwinter Meeting. The following is the report presented at the 2007 Midwinter Meeting in Seattle.

As President of the Freedom to Read Foundation, I am pleased to report on the Foundation’s activities since the 2006 Annual Conference.

DEFENDING PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

You may recall that last year in San Antonio, author Sandra Cisneros generously agreed to appear at a fundraiser for the Freedom to Read Foundation. Her appearance drew an enthusiastic audience and generated much-needed funds and new members for FTRF.

Continuing that tradition, on Sunday night, January 21, author Chris Crutcher served as the guest of honor at the Foundation’s second annual Midwinter Meeting fundraiser. Chris is a remarkable individual who writes

with compassion about the lives of young adults. An advocate for the freedom to read, he has stood with and supported teachers and librarians working to keep books—his, as well as others’—on library shelves.

In his time with us, Chris described his experiences as one of the most challenged authors of the past decade, describing the young adults who have come to him to tell him how they have seen their lives in his powerful works of realistic fiction. His stories about a troubled young father and his fond memories of librarian Michael Printz touched us all. Chris then signed books, generously agreeing to stay until he met everyone in the long line of his admirers.

The Freedom to Read Foundation thanks Chris, a member of the Freedom to Read Foundation, for supporting the Foundation’s work. We also thank Greenwillow Press, Chris’ publisher, who generously donated the books for the event; and thank the Seattle Public Library and its Director, Deborah Jacobs, a Trustee of the Foundation, for donating the space for the event at the extraordinary Main Library. As a result of their generosity, the Foundation now has new members and new funds to sustain its work. *See p. 8 for photos.*

SAFEGUARDING OUR RIGHT TO PRIVACY

Last summer’s report described the Freedom to Read Foundation’s work in support of the Connecticut librarians who courageously stood up to the FBI by challenging the constitutionality of the National Security Letter (NSL) provision of the USA PATRIOT Act. Ultimately, the government withdrew the NSL served on The Library Connection, resulting in a great victory for The Library Connection and the library patrons it serves. It is very important to note, however, that by withdrawing the NSL, the government prevented actual review of the NSL statute.

Now, the government has similarly evaded judicial review of the National Security Letter statute by withdrawing the NSL served on the original “John Doe,” the anonymous plaintiff who filed the first lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the NSL statute in Doe v. Gonzales.

As I reported earlier, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals returned “John Doe’s” lawsuit to Judge Marrero of the Southern District of New York, instructing the judge to reconsider his original opinion that found the use of NSLs unconstitutional in light of the changes to the law following the reauthorization of the USA

PATRIOT Act in March 2006. With the assistance of the ACLU and the support of FTRF, “John Doe” refiled his complaint, asking the court to strike down the reauthorized NSL statute on constitutional grounds.

Rather than re-litigate the case, the government withdrew the NSL on November 22, 2006. Because the FBI refused to lift the gag order that prevents “John Doe” from disclosing its identity or discussing the NSL, the ACLU continues to challenge the gag order. Briefing is proceeding before the court.

Since the reauthorized PATRIOT Act imposes significant burdens on those who wish to challenge an NSL, it is unlikely we will see an open adjudication of the NSL statute on its own merits in the near future.

Similarly, the lawsuit challenging Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, Muslim Community Association of Ann Arbor v. Gonzales, concluded without any substantive review of the law. After three years of inaction, Judge Denise Page Hood finally ruled the plaintiffs could proceed with their lawsuit, and instructed the plaintiffs to file an amended complaint that addressed the law as reauthorized by Congress in March 2006. On October 27, citing the changes to the USA PATRIOT Act, the ACLU withdrew the lawsuit but vowed to continue monitoring the government’s use of Section 215 for possible civil liberties violations.

We also are involved in a legal battle to preserve the right to read anonymously. Forensic Advisors, Inc. v. Matrixx Initiatives, Inc. seeks to quash a subpoena served on a financial advisor’s newsletter. The plaintiff, Matrixx Initiatives, is demanding the names of the newsletter’s subscribers on the grounds that one or more of the subscribers may be responsible for anonymous Internet posts Matrixx says are defamatory.

In September, the Maryland Court of Special Appeals refused to quash the subpoena but held that Timothy Mulligan, the newsletter’s editor and publisher, could assert the news media privilege. Mr. Mulligan, hoping to vindicate both his rights and the rights of his subscribers, petitioned the Court of Appeals, the highest court in Maryland, which has taken up the case. FTRF anticipates joining an *amicus* brief in support of Mulligan’s effort to protect the privacy of his readers.

[Update: In March, the underlying litigation, which Matrixx initiated in Arizona, was dismissed and so, on a motion from Matrixx, the Maryland Court of Appeals declared the Maryland case moot.]

Despite these setbacks in the privacy arena, the sea change wrought by the November elections has brought new hope that the deleterious effects on our privacy and our civil liberties resulting from this administration's use of the USA PATRIOT Act and similar initiatives will be moderated by Congress. Representatives have introduced legislation to assure the right to *habeas corpus*, to regulate and prevent data mining, and to amend and reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in order to prevent warrantless wiretapping conducted by the National Security Agency. It is refreshing to speak about how members of Congress are working to preserve our rights, rather than anticipating future battles against laws that undermine our right to be free from unwarranted government surveillance.

[Update: On April 11, former “John Doe” George Christian of The Library Connection testified before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution about his experience of receiving a National Security Letter and the burden of the gag order.]

SAFEGUARDING THE FREEDOM TO READ

This fall, FTRF joined in three new lawsuits aimed at protecting our rights under the First Amendment:

The first lawsuit, The Local Church v. Harvest House Publishers sought to address the chilling effect of libel litigation on authors and publishers. A religious group called the Local Church filed a libel action against authors John Ankerberg and John Weldon and their publisher, Harvest House, after the Local Church was included in the authors' work, *The Encyclopedia of Cults and New Religions*. The Texas Court of Appeals dismissed the lawsuit after holding that the Local Church's inclusion neither defamed the plaintiff nor provided grounds for a suit, as the determination that a group is a cult depends on an individual's religious beliefs. The Local Church subsequently asked the Texas Supreme Court for review.

FTRF joined the Association of American Publishers (AAP), the American Booksellers Foundation for Free Expression (ABFFE), and the American Association of University Presses (AAUP) to file an *amicus curiae* brief urging the Texas Supreme Court to uphold the Court of Appeals' decision to dismiss the lawsuit. In December, we were pleased to learn that the Texas Supreme Court denied the Local Church's petition for review, effectively dismissing their lawsuit. The plaintiffs have petitioned for a rehearing, however, and we are waiting for the court's decision on that motion.

The second lawsuit, American Civil Liberties Union of Florida v. Miami-Dade School Board addresses the decision of the Miami-Dade School Board to remove the books *A Visit to Cuba* and *Vamos a Cuba* and all the books in the “A Visit To” series on the grounds the books are educationally unsuitable and offensive to members of Miami's Cuban community. When the district court ruled the removal was unconstitutionally motivated and entered a preliminary injunction ordering the school district to immediately replace the entire series on library shelves, the Miami-Dade School Board appealed the decision to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. FTRF joined ABFFE, the Association of Booksellers for Children (ABC), REFORMA, Peacefire, and the National Coalition Against Censorship (NCAC) to file an *amicus* brief urging the Eleventh Circuit to uphold the district court's findings. We now are waiting for the court's decision.

The third lawsuit, Entertainment Software Association, et al. v. Hatch, seeks to overturn Minnesota's Restricted Video Games Act, which imposes civil penalties on minors who rent video games rated “AO” or “M” by the Entertainment Software Rating Board (ESRB). The statute also requires retailers to post signs warning minors about the prohibition.

The District Court of Minnesota ruled the law unconstitutional in July 2006. It held that there was no showing that a statute restricting minors' access to violent video games alone would protect children. It also held the statute unconstitutionally delegated the state's authority by using the ESRB's ratings and unconstitutionally compelled speech by requiring retailers to post signs about the law. When the state appealed to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, the Foundation joined ABFFE, AAP, International Periodical Distributors Association (IPDA), Motion Picture Association of America, Inc. (MPAA), Publishers Marketing Association (PMA), and Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) to file an *amicus* brief urging the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals to uphold the district court's decision. We are waiting for the court to schedule oral arguments.

In regard to litigation addressing restrictions on minors' right to access video games, I am pleased to report a successful result in Entertainment Software Association v. Blagojevich. The original lawsuit asked the court to enjoin enforcement of two Illinois statutes limiting the sale and rental of violent and sexually explicit computer and video games to minors. After the federal district court ruled the laws unconstitu-

tional, the attorney general appealed the decision concerning the Sexually Explicit Video Game Law to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. FTRF filed an *amicus* brief with several partners to argue that the law's provisions violate the First Amendment. On November 27, 2006, the Seventh Circuit upheld the lower court's determination that the statute is unconstitutional.

The Foundation also is participating in the following:

Gonzales v. American Civil Liberties Union (formerly Ashcroft v. ACLU): In June 2004, the Supreme Court issued an opinion upholding the injunction barring enforcement of the Child Online Protection Act (COPA) and 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, given the ability of parents to purchase and use Internet filtering software. Trial began in October 2006, and the parties presented their evidence regarding the effectiveness of filtering programs for four weeks.

Regretfully, the Supreme Court recently upheld a Pennsylvania Department of Corrections policy restricting long-term prisoners' access to newspapers, magazines, and books. In Beard v. Banks, FTRF argued that the prison's policy impermissibly infringed 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. By a 6-2 decision issued on June 28, 2006, the Court held that prison officials had demonstrated adequate support for their policy and that the policy was rationally related to legitimate objectives of prison safety and rehabilitation. (Justice Alito recused himself, as he sat on the Third Circuit when the case was heard there, and filed a vigorous dissent of the opinion to overturn the policy.)

There are two additional lawsuits the Foundation is monitoring due to their importance to the library community. At this time, FTRF is not a participant in either lawsuit. The first, Sarah Bradburn, et al. v. North Central Regional Library District, is the first legal challenge to a library's Internet filtering policies filed since the Supreme Court upheld the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA). The complaint, filed by the American Civil Liberties Union of Washington State in November 2006, not only alleges that the library filters Internet content too broadly, but also that the library refuses to unblock its filters when requested to do so by adult patrons. The library has denied the allegations,

and the case is now proceeding before the U.S. District Court in the Eastern District of Washington.

The second lawsuit, Faith Center Church Evangelistic Ministries v. Glover, was filed in July 2004 after a local religious group was barred from using the Contra Costa County (CA) Public Library's meeting room because the group wanted to hold religious services. After the district court ruled the group was likely to succeed on its First Amendment claims and entered a preliminary injunction ordering enjoining the library not to enforce its meeting room policy, the county appealed the decision to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. That court reversed the district court's finding of unconstitutionality on the grounds that the library's policy was reasonable in light of the library's intended use of its public forum. The plaintiffs asked the Court of Appeals for a rehearing on October 3, and their motion is pending before that court.

SAFEGUARDING INTERNET ACCESS: STATE INTERNET CONTENT LAWS

In the states, legislatures continue to pass laws criminalizing the publication of Internet content deemed "harmful to minors." FTRF actively pursues opportunities to challenge these laws in order to assure the right of individuals to decide for themselves what they read and see on the Internet.

The most pressing lawsuit is filed in Utah, where FTRF is part of a challenge to a Utah statute that extends the state's "harmful to minors" prohibitions to the Internet. In 2005, FTRF joined with ABFFE, AAP, CBLDF, the ACLU of Utah, and several Utah bookstores, Internet providers, and residents to bring the lawsuit, The King's English v. Shurtleff.

On August 25, 2006, the district court enjoined enforcement of the law and gave the state government until November to propose amendments to it that would cure its defects. After examining the state's proposed changes, the plaintiffs concluded the amendments would not cure the law's constitutional defects and sent a letter to the state government demanding that the state comply with outstanding discovery requests. The case is pending.

[Update: On February 28, the Utah legislature passed an amended bill, which repealed a section of the original bill establishing an Adult Content Registry. On April 30, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint arguing the act is still unconstitutional.]

STATE LEGISLATION

Although we are only a few weeks into the new legislative season, we are seeing several state-level initiatives aimed at restricting the right of library users to access information. Among these is a Virginia proposal to require libraries to install filters to receive funding.

State legislatures in three states—Kentucky, Montana, and Missouri—are considering adopting an “Academic Bill of Rights” or “intellectual diversity” provisions that would restrict academic freedom on campus. Utah is considering a new statute that would prohibit the distribution of “inappropriate violence” as “harmful to minors.” Both New York and Virginia are considering new restrictions on violent video games and video games that contain racial or religious stereotypes. And South Carolina’s legislature is considering a bill that would make it a crime to disseminate profanity to a minor or to use profanity in a public forum.

Finally, Illinois is facing a concerted challenge to the state library confidentiality act, initiated by police officers who believe they should have unfettered access to users’ library records, without a court order.

FUNDRAISING

I am pleased to report that the Freedom to Read Foundation has new membership brochures reflecting

the breadth and depth of its efforts to advance the First Amendment and protect intellectual freedom and privacy in our society. One brochure is for individual members; the second brochure includes information on the new “organizational member” category that allows libraries and other institutions to support the FTRF’s work at a more substantial level. Increasing organizational membership is a priority this year. Please urge your library, Friends group, business, and other organizations you are affiliated with to join FTRF.

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 for organizations. Student membership is \$10.00. Contributions to FTRF 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.

Photos from January’s Chris Crutcher event

