


[Free read ebook] New York Times v. Sullivan: Civil Rights, Libel Law, and the Free Press (Landmark Law Cases American Society)

New York Times v. Sullivan: Civil Rights, Libel Law, and the Free Press (Landmark Law Cases American Society)

Kermit L. Hall, Melvin I. Urofsky

**Download PDF | ePub | DOC | audiobook | ebooks*



DOWNLOAD



READ ONLINE

#971014 in Books 2011-09-06Original language:EnglishPDF # 1 8.64 x .68 x 5.58l, .68 #File Name: 0700618031232 pages | File size: 45.Mb

Kermit L. Hall, Melvin I. Urofsky : New York Times v. Sullivan: Civil Rights, Libel Law, and the Free Press (Landmark Law Cases American Society) before purchasing it in order to gage whether or not it would be worth my time, and all praised New York Times v. Sullivan: Civil Rights, Libel Law, and the Free Press (Landmark Law Cases American Society):

0 of 0 people found the following review helpful. Supreme Court decision that transformed the South

By Ricardo Mio Can a Supreme Court decision change the social fabric of the nation? *New York Times v. Sullivan* was about civil rights, libel law, and the first amendment. But it also was about something deeper how far apart North and South had become in their views of libel and honor. While many of the litigants saw the suit as a means of retaliating against northern newspapers that supported civil rights, says the author, they also believed that the Times had no understanding of Southern mores. Having done a great deal of research, author Kermit L. Hall died after having written but two articles, which became parts of chapters 1, 2, and 11. Finishing the book fell upon writer and professor of history and law Melvin I. Urofsky. The book is not long (206 pages of text) and reads with the fluency of a good novel. I place it with *Gideons Trumpet* (by Anthony Lewis) and *Minnesota Rag* (Fred W. Friendly) as informative and readable books about landmark Supreme Court decisions. At the height of the civil rights movement, a New York City advocacy group ran a full-page ad in the *New York Times* entitled, "Heed Their Rising Voices." The purpose of the ad was to create awareness and raise money for the civil rights movement. The ad didn't name individuals in its account of abuses, but it did mention specific towns including Montgomery, Alabama. The irony is that practically no one in the state of Alabama--where circulation was less than 400 papers statewide--was even aware of the ad until an assistant editor of the *Montgomery Advertiser* brought it to the attention of the Montgomery city attorney. He shared it with three other public officials, one of whom was a commissioner for the Alabama police department Lester Sullivan. Sullivan and everyone else in the all-white government office took offense. The honor of civic leaders was under attack by Northern outsiders. Southern honor (and the prospect of bankrupting the civil rights movement in the South) induced Sullivan and others to file suit for defamation. Alabama trial and appeals courts agreed and the Times was ordered to pay half-a-million dollars in damages. In a companion case, four of the members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (all ministers) were also sued for having allowed their names to be listed as endorsees of the ads content, even though they had not approved of their inclusion in the ad as endorsees nor in fact had knowledge of the ad until it was published in the Times. The *New York Times* appealed, and in a precedent-setting decision the United States Supreme Court overruled the lower court's decision. Writing for a unanimous Court, Justice William Brennan declared Alabama's Supreme Court decision would have a chilling effect on public debate, which was contrary to the First Amendment. Public discussion is not always polite or accurate, Brennan wrote. It can get nasty and messy and loud, but it still must be protected. Debate in public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open, and that it may well include vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and public officials. "One of the direct results of the 1964 Supreme Court ruling was that the civil rights movement was able to continue its work in the South. That, coupled with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, would result in widespread voter registrations among African Americans, and the integration of all-white public agencies such as Montgomery city hall and the Montgomery police department. Also brought about by the Courts decision was a transformation of white Southern mores. In many respects, the South before the civil rights era retained many of the aspects of a feudal society, where the honor of public officials was not called into question, indeed, was considered above reproach and necessary to preserving law and order in the community. In such a society slander and libel was not tolerated because it might undermine a respect for authority. The laws of defamation have their roots in English feudal society, and grew out of an attempt to prevent violence, writes the author. In an era when the personal bonds rather than a powerful state held society together an attack on the good name of one feudal lord constituted an assault on the basis of society. Southern leadership fought the civil rights movement because it offended their sense of honor and threatened their long-standing hierarchy of white supremacy. The industrial North a vast unsettled melting pot of peoples and ideas dispatched with such quaint notions when it entered the Industrial Age. Honor mattered less in a teeming dynamic society where fortunes were won and lost overnight; what mattered was a man's reputation. In the South, where land was still the measure of wealth and honor was prized above all else, libel laws were strictly enforced. If nothing else, *New York Times v. Sullivan* brought Southern libel laws in line with modern society. But it did much more than that. With the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act, *New York v. Sullivan* changed the social fabric of the South.

1 of 1 people found the following review helpful. Fascinating Story

By Gerald Swimmer There is an old saying that bad facts makes good law. This book describes the facts behind the seminal case that defines the intersection between free speech and libel law. The ad which was the subject of the case was not properly fact checked by the Times, unauthorized names were put in the ad, and the wrong song was described which could have shown that the Times was negligent. On the other hand, no public official was named, Alabama had defied the Supreme Court in a previous race based case and the libel case was intended to stop coverage of the civil rights movement in Alabama. All of these issues were set forth clearly in this excellent narrative. As so often happened in history happenstance started the case which was first not noticed by the citizens of Montgomery. Then the case had a life of its own as it moves forward accelerated by the feelings in the South that Northerners were not fair. The book sets forth all of this in a clear manner without being bogged down in a great deal of legal discussion. The authors say that as compared to Anthony Lewis book this is more about race than the First Amendment. I think it did a good job on the law. I am disappointed to be the first reviewer. I hope others will pick this book up and enjoy it as much as I have.

Illuminating a classic case from the turbulent civil rights era of the 1960s, two of America's foremost legal historians Kermit Hall and Melvin Urofsky provide a compact and highly readable updating of one of the most memorable decisions in the Supreme Court's canon. When the New York Times published an advertisement that accused Alabama officials of willfully abusing civil rights activists, Montgomery police commissioner Lester Sullivan filed suit for defamation. Alabama courts, citing factual errors in the ad, ordered the Times to pay half a million dollars in damages. The Times appealed to the Supreme Court, which had previously deferred to the states on libel issues. The justices, recognizing that Alabama's application of libel law threatened both the nation's free press and equal rights for African Americans, unanimously sided with the Times. As memorably recounted twenty years ago in Anthony Lewis's *Make No Law*, the 1964 decision profoundly altered defamation law, which the Court declared must not hinder debate on public issues even if it includes "vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and public officials." The decision also introduced a new First Amendment test: a public official cannot recover damages for libel unless he proves that the statement was made with the knowledge that it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false. Hall and Urofsky, however, place a new emphasis on this iconic case. Whereas Lewis's book championed freedom of the press, the authors here provide a stronger focus on civil rights and southern legal culture. They convey to readers the urgency of the civil rights movement and the vitriolic anger it inspired in the Deep South. Their insights place this landmark case within a new and enlightening frame.

By connecting what most commentators have seen as a controversial freedom of press case to the contentious civil rights movement that produced it, Hall and Urofsky have provided new insights into both legal and political history. An excellent and accessible book about an important moment in American history. Steven F. Lawson, author of *Civil Rights Crossroads: Nation, Community, and the Black Freedom Movement* When the court declared that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open, it said something profound, and this account properly focuses on that extraordinary finding. . . . A remarkably timely book. Todd Gitlin, author of *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Years of Rage* From the Back Cover "By connecting what most commentators have seen as a controversial freedom of press case to the contentious civil rights movement that produced it, Hall and Urofsky have provided new insights into both legal and political history. An excellent and accessible book about an important moment in American history."--Steven F. Lawson, author of *Civil Rights Crossroads: Nation, Community, and the Black Freedom Movement* "When the court declared that 'debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open,' it said something profound, and this account properly focuses on that extraordinary finding. . . . A remarkably timely book."--Todd Gitlin, author of *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Years of Rage* About the Author The late KERMIT L. HALL was president of SUNY-Albany and author, editor, or co-editor of more than two dozen books. He is best known for *The Magic Mirror: Law in American History* and *The Oxford Companion to the Supreme Court*. MELVIN I. UROFSKY is professor emeritus of history and professor of law and public policy at Virginia Commonwealth University. Among his many books are the prize winning *Louis D. Brandeis: A Life*; the two-volume *March of Liberty: A Constitutional History of the United States*; and *Money and Free Speech: Campaign Finance Reform and the Courts*.