

ASSAULT ON FREE SPEECH REJECTED

A recent decision by the Supreme Court resulted in striking down a Massachusetts law that created a 35-foot buffer zone near clinics for those protesting abortion.

The ruling, *McCullen v. Coakley*, did not address the morality or the legality of abortion, which is why this case, which was wholly about free speech, should have been a slam dunk decision for everyone. It was for the high court: it voted 9-0.

So who are those that are opposed to free speech? The ACLU, for one. Every ten years or so it finds a few neo-Nazis or Klansmen to defend, and then convinces elites that it is a champion of free speech. But it takes no courage to defend crackpots who pose no real threat to our liberties. A better test would be for the rabidly pro-abortion ACLU to defend the free speech rights of pro-life advocates. Again and again, it fails to do so. In this case it explicitly remained neutral, filing an amicus brief on both sides. Which means it wasn't neutral on the First Amendment, its *raison d'être*: it flatly rejected it.

The pro-abortion industry is unanimous in its contempt for free speech. Jan Erickson of the National Organization for Women Foundation told us in January what she thinks of protesters who pray at abortion clinics: "There can be no other way to describe in a single word what antiabortion protesters have engaged in for four decades and that is *terrorism*." (Her italic.)

The good news is that these lying fanatics lost. But we need to reflect, not relax. Just think for a moment who these people are: Their entire professional life is dedicated to

killing unborn babies and killing the First Amendment.