















Our First Amendment jurisprudence recognizes "that a principal function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger." Texas v. Johnson, 491 U.S. 397, 408 9 (1989) (quoting Terminiella v. Chicago, 337 U.S. 1, 4 (1949).

"Not every abusive outburst or offensive verbal encounter may be converted into a tort" and the law should not "close all the safety valves through which irascible tempers might legally blow off steam."
Eddy v. Brown, 715 P.2d 74, 77 (Okla. 1986).

The court noted that "at a minimum, allowing the plaintiffs to recover would offend the spirit of the First Amendment. Defendants wrote about a miscarriage of justice and attempted to encourage political and social change. To the extent their perceptions of the affair were erroneous, we depend on the marketplace of ideas—not the whim of the bench—to correct insidious opinions." Peterson v. Grisham, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 70206 (E.D. Okla. 2008), aff 'd, 594 F.3d 723, 38 Media L. Rep. 1330 (10th Cir. 2010)