

## Court Invokes First Amendment

February 16, 2023

This is where we're at. We must be in suspense about whether a judge will object when governments act to repress speech in the name of combatting "misinformation," "disinformation," or "hate speech."

Fortunately, Judge Andrew Carter [sees the obvious](#) and has blocked a new New York State law to regulate "hateful" online speech. The law was challenged by anti-censorship video platform Rumble and the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression.

**Laws like New York's constitute a *cart blanche* for government to repress speech — any speech.**

Carter says: "The First Amendment protects from state regulation speech that may be deemed 'hateful,' and generally disfavors regulation of speech based on its content unless it is narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest."

The alleged "compelling governmental interest"



exception is vague and not really consistent with the First Amendment. But the judge otherwise makes sense.

Laws like New York's constitute a *cart blanche* for government to repress speech — any speech.

Any controversial words can be labeled hateful, misinformative, disinformative. People have been censored for asseverating that there are only two sexes, that the COVID-19 injections aren't really vaccines, that the U.S. shouldn't send more than \$100 bazillion to Ukraine, etc.

It's hatefully misinformative disinformation to proclaim that debates about such questions are impermissible. But people in any case have a right to be wrong; others, the right to refute them.

When the truth is on your side, you have an advantage. But you can't beam your understanding into the minds of others.

You must be free to speak.

This is Common Sense. I'm Paul Jacob.