

High Court Rules For Anti-Gay Protesters At Funerals

by NINA TOTENBERG



Nicholas Kamm/AFP/Getty Images

Members of the Westboro Baptist Church of Topeka, Kan., staged a protest across the street from a high school in Hyattsville, Md., a day before the Supreme Court ruling.

March 2, 2011

text size **A A A**

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that protesters at military funerals cannot be sued for inflicting emotional distress on the family of a dead soldier. The vote was 8 to 1.

When Marine Lance Cpl. Matthew Snyder was killed in Iraq, his funeral in Westminster, Md., drew thousands to pay their respects. But it also drew a protest from the Rev. Fred Phelps and six other members of the Westboro Baptist Church, based in Topeka, Kan.

Phelps and other church members have traveled the country for years, picketing hundreds of military funerals to communicate their belief that "God hates the USA" for its tolerance of homosexuality, particularly in the military.

The picketers did not contend that Snyder was gay. Rather, their message, as Phelps puts it, was that "the whole country is given over to sodomy and to sodomite enablers."

The picketers followed their usual practice at the Snyder funeral. They alerted police in advance and followed instructions to set up their protest on public property, at a site 1,000 feet away from the church, near the vehicle entrance.

Speech is powerful. It can stir people to action, move them to tears of both joy and sorrow, and ... inflict great pain. On the facts before us, we cannot react to that pain by punishing the speaker.

Though the protest was peaceful and ended before the funeral began, the picketers carried signs with messages offensive to many, including "Thank God for Dead Soldiers," "Fags Doom Nations" and "America Is Doomed."

- Chief Justice John Roberts, in the majority opinion

Albert Snyder, the father of the dead Marine, did not see the signs until later when he viewed TV coverage. He says the picketers turned his son's funeral into a circus, taking away his "last moment" with his son.

"This was a funeral. This wasn't a parade going down the street. I shouldn't have to look away from anything at my own child's funeral," Snyder says. "That's absurd."

Snyder sued Phelps and his church for intentional infliction of emotional distress.

"These people targeted me and my family, and they have done this to over 200 other military men and women's families," Snyder says, his voice rising. "I want to know how you would feel if somebody stood 30 feet away from the main vehicle entrance of a church where you're trying to bury your mother, with a sign that says, 'Thank God for dead sluts.' You tell me that shouldn't be illegal. Is 'fag' any worse than 'slut'?"

A jury agreed with Snyder and awarded him \$5 million in damages. But the Supreme Court set aside that verdict Wednesday.

Writing for the court majority, Chief Justice John Roberts said that as repugnant as many of the signs were, they were still plainly related to public, rather than private, matters. They focused on "the political and moral conduct of the United States and its citizens," he said, and speech of such public concern is protected by the First Amendment.

Our profound national commitment to free and open debate is not a license for the vicious verbal assault that occurred in this case.

Although Westboro may have chosen to protest the funeral to gain publicity for its views, said the chief justice, and although those views may be particularly hurtful to the dead soldier's father, that does not mean the church members' right of free speech can be curtailed or punished. And a jury award amounts to punishment, Roberts contended, by imposing a penalty for expressing an unpopular viewpoint.

- Justice Samuel Alito, who cast the lone dissenting vote

"Speech is powerful," Roberts said in conclusion. "It can stir people to action, move them to tears of both joy and sorrow, and — as it did here — inflict great pain. On the facts before us, we cannot react to that pain by punishing the speaker. As a nation we have chosen a different course — to protect even hurtful speech on public issues to ensure that we do not stifle public debate."

Reaction to the decision was markedly muted, given the outrage voiced by veterans groups and politicians at the time the case was argued in the Supreme Court.

The Democratic and Republican leaders of the Senate, along with 40 other members of Congress, filed a brief on Snyder's side. But on Wednesday, reaction on Capitol Hill was nowhere to be found, except in a couple of written statements.

Lawyer Gene Schaerr, who filed a brief in the case for the American Legion, said he was heartened by the fact that the court specifically mentioned that 43 states have enacted laws that put a buffer zone of 100 feet or more around funeral sites. Such laws would not have affected the protest in this case, since protesters were 1,000 feet away.



Nonetheless, says Schaerr, the decision "sends a clear signal to the lower courts that they should not interpret anything in this opinion as casting any doubt about those statutes." The court, however, specifically left open that question, noting that restrictions on the time, place and manner of protests are appropriate in some circumstances.

Wednesday's 8-to-1 ruling came as no surprise to First Amendment scholars, both right and left. They note that the decision is in line with many court decisions protecting the rights of fringe groups — from Nazis marching in Skokie, Ill., to flag burners at a Republican convention in Texas.

University of Chicago law professor Geoffrey Stone notes that Wednesday's ruling fits neatly into that tradition, calling it a "classic case." The only surprise, maintained Stone, was that anyone dissented.

Justice Samuel Alito was the lone dissenter. He viewed the protesters' speech as targeting a private person — the father of the dead soldier — and said that the First Amendment does not give license to such outrageous conduct.

"In order to have a society in which public issues can be openly and vigorously debated," wrote Alito, "it is not necessary to allow the brutalization of innocent victims."

Related NPR Stories

• A Peek Inside The Westboro Baptist Church March 2, 2011

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH REPORT

DECEMBER 9, 2011



REPORT NUMBER 12.113

FUNERAL PROTEST LAWS IN OTHER STATES

PREPARED FOR REPRESENTATIVE BILL THOMAS, JR.

BY ROGER WITHINGTON, LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

SUMMARY	1
STATE LAWS PERTAINING TO FUNERAL PROTESTS	2
<i>Table 1: Summary of State Funeral Protest Laws, May 2011</i>	3
CHALLENGED AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATE FUNERAL PROTEST LAWS	3
LIST OF ATTACHMENTS	5

You asked for information on funeral protest laws. Specifically, you wished to know how many states currently have a law regulating funeral protests and what each state law stipulates. You also wanted to know for each state that currently has a funeral protest law if violating the restriction is considered a felony or misdemeanor offense. In addition, you asked if any of the state laws have been challenged and if any have been found unconstitutional.

SUMMARY

As you may know, for a number of years the Westboro Baptist Church of Topeka, Kansas has been protesting, among other events, military funerals. These protests have garnered the Church a great deal of national attention.¹ The Church's primary message at these protests is that God hates the United

¹ Summary information was extracted from Kathleen Ann Ruane, *Funeral Protests: Selected Federal Laws and Constitutional Issues*, Congressional Research Service, March 22, 2011, and the Westboro Baptist Church's website.

States for its tolerance of homosexuality. As punishment for its tolerance, God is killing soldiers “in righteous judgment against an evil nation.”

As a result of these protests, state and local governments have adopted measures that create “buffer zones” that ban protests of funerals within a certain distance of the services and that establish time restrictions as to when protests can occur in relation to a funeral service. Additionally, the federal government has passed similar bans on protests at military funerals in federally controlled cemeteries.

STATE LAWS PERTAINING TO FUNERAL PROTESTS

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), 46 states currently have some form of a funeral protest law. In Table 1, we provide a summary of these state laws; we include a more detailed summary of each state’s law in Attachment A.

Of the 31 states identified in Table 1 that impose a restriction on the time in which a protest may take place in relation to the funeral service, 22 specify that a protest may not occur any time one hour prior to, during, or one hour after the conclusion of the funeral or memorial service. The remaining nine states specify a time restriction range from 30 minutes to 120 minutes before and after the service.

As you can see from Table 1, 39 states create a “buffer zone” that restricts protests of funerals within a certain distance of the service. These buffer zones range from 150 feet to 1,500 feet. The most typical distance, used by 15 states, is 500 feet.

Seven states—California, Florida, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Rhode Island, and Virginia—chose not to create time or distance buffer zones but instead appear to have amended their disorderly conduct or disturbing the peace statutes to include protests at funeral or memorial services.

Thirty-six states classify the first violation of these funeral protest laws as misdemeanors. Although several states classify the second offense as a felony, two states—Indiana and Michigan—classify the first offense as a felony.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF STATE FUNERAL PROTEST LAWS, MAY 2011	
Regulation	States
Time Requirement	Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan ⁽¹⁾ , Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
Distance Requirement	Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
First Offense Classified as a Misdemeanor	Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
Source: <i>Funeral Protest Regulation Statutory Provisions</i> , National Conference of State Legislatures, May 18, 2011, Jon Griffin, Policy Associate, Fiscal Affairs Program, National Conference of State Legislatures, 303-364-7700 ext. 1529. Notes: (1) Michigan law authorizes local governments to create laws that restrict funeral protests from one hour immediately before, or during, or two hours immediately following a service.	

In Attachment B, we provide a sample of funeral protest laws from ten states—Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Washington.

According to the NCSL, all four of the states that do not currently have a funeral protest law—Alaska, Hawaii, Nevada, and Oregon—considered such a measure during the last legislative session. Measures in Alaska and Hawaii are still active, while the measures in Nevada and Oregon have failed. Additionally, many states sought to amend their existing laws. We include, as Attachment C, a NCSL summary of all state legislation considered during the last legislative session that pertains to funeral protests.