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The following is another guest post from Timothy Zick (William & Mary).

Some of my First Amendment work has focused on highlighting the social, political, and constitutional benefits of public protests. Protests can also impose serious costs. Mass protests can be particularly invasive forms of contention. They disrupt routines, alter urban and other landscapes, and inconvenience entire communities. Some of these effects may actually make a protest more effective – unlike a pamphlet or this blog post, a mass protest cannot easily be ignored. Still, for those caught in its path, a public protest (or a prolonged series of them) can impose very real and significant costs.

Some of the costs of the Ferguson protests (past and anticipated), have received some media attention. Merchants are concerned that the prolonged state of unrest will harm their enterprises. Ferguson schools have been closed in anticipation of the grand jury’s decision. And there are the costs of policing the protests themselves, which can add up to millions (including the cost of any civil rights lawsuits and settlements, as New York City and other jurisdictions have learned). The psychological costs can also be significant. Living in an environment of daily conflict and protest policing can take its toll on communities. For example, many people seemed to lose patience with the Occupy protests – not just because of the tangible costs they imposed, but also owing to the emotional and psychological strain associated with long-term “occupation.”

Recognizing these costs does not diminish rights of free speech and peaceable assembly. Indeed, it places First Amendment rights in appropriate perspective. In general, we cherish and protect these rights despite their significant financial and other costs. We collectively accept these burdens as the price of expressive freedoms. We subsidize them, even when the distribution of costs sometimes seems unfair. (We also have the right to complain about this unfairness.) However, as protest organizers should know, there are limits to public tolerance. There is a point at which public support begins to wane and the effectiveness of public contention begins to diminish. Sooner or later, protesters will need to channel their outdoor energies to indoor political and other arenas. As Michael Brown’s father suggested in a video appeal to protesters, the time will come when protest will need to be translated into policy changes. To some degree, the mark of a successful protest movement is its ability to effect meaningful change. Protests have inherent worth. But the subsidies and sacrifices are all the more “worth it” insofar as they facilitate or produce something tangible, meaningful, and lasting.
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