

## TINKER V. DES MOINES

**Summary**

John and Mary Beth Tinker attended public school in Des Moines, Iowa. In December of 1965 a community group in Des Moines decided to protest American involvement in the Vietnam War by wearing black armbands. The Tinkers agreed to wear their black armbands to school. However, principals in the school district created a rule that any student wearing an armband to school would be suspended unless the student removed the armband. Although the Tinkers knew about this rule, they came to school wearing their armbands. After refusing to take the armbands off, John and Mary Beth Tinker were sent home by the principal. Their suspension lasted until they agreed to come back to school without the armbands.

The Tinkers filed a suit in the U.S. District Court to stop the school principals from enforcing the rule in the future. Although the District Court said that this type of protest was a form of expression protected under the First Amendment's freedom of speech clause, the Court sided with the school officials, saying that the rule was needed to "prevent the disturbance of school activities." The Tinkers appealed their case to the U.S. Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, but they lost. The Tinkers decided to appeal the case to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The fundamental question of the case came down to this: Does the First Amendment's promise of free speech extend to the symbolic speech of public school students? And, if so, in what circumstances is that symbolic speech protected? The First Amendment to the Constitution says, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech." The Fourteenth Amendment extends this rule to state government as well, of which schools are a part. However, the First Amendment does not say which kinds of speech are protected. It also does not specify what types of expressive actions should be considered as speech.

The question of what kind of speech or action is protected under the First Amendment has been considered many times by the Supreme Court of the United States. Generally, the Court has held that the First Amendment protects adult symbolic speech that does not harm or threaten to harm. However, at the time of *Tinker*, it was unclear whether students' rights in this area were different.

In 1968 the Supreme Court of the United States agreed to hear the Tinker's case and consider whether the Des Moines public schools ban on armbands was an unconstitutional violation of the students' right to free speech. The Court's decision in *Tinker v. Des Moines* was handed down in 1969.

## MAJORITY OPINION

**The Court ruled 7 to 2. Justice Fortas delivered the majority opinion of the Court.**

Five justices agreed with the majority opinion. Two justices concurred, meaning that they agreed with the Court's decision that the school policy was unconstitutional, but they wrote separately to explain their reasoning. Two justices dissented. Justice Fortas delivered the majority opinion of the Court.

. . . First Amendment rights, applied in light of the special characteristics of the school environment, are available to teachers and students. It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate. . . .

. . . On the other hand, the Court has repeatedly emphasized the need for affirming the comprehensive authority of the States and of school officials, consistent with fundamental constitutional safeguards, to prescribe and control conduct in the schools. Our problem involves direct, primary First Amendment rights akin to "pure speech"

. . . In order for the State in the person of school officials to justify prohibition of a particular expression of opinion, it must be able to show that its action was caused by something more than a mere desire to avoid the discomfort and unpleasantness that always accompany an unpopular viewpoint. Certainly where there is no finding and no showing that engaging in the forbidden conduct would "materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school," the prohibition cannot be sustained . . .

. . . the record fails to yield evidence that the school authorities had reason to anticipate that the wearing of the armbands would substantially interfere with the work of the school or impinge upon the rights of other students . . . [and] the school officials banned and sought to punish petitioners for a silent, passive expression of opinion, unaccompanied by any disorder or disturbance on the part of petitioners. . . .

It is also relevant that the school authorities did not purport to prohibit the wearing of all symbols of political or controversial significance . . . Instead, a particular symbol - black armbands worn to exhibit opposition to this Nation's involvement in Vietnam - was singled out for prohibition. Clearly, the prohibition of expression of one particular opinion, at least without evidence that it is necessary to avoid material and substantial interference with schoolwork or discipline, is not constitutionally permissible. In our system, state-operated schools may not be enclaves of totalitarianism. School officials do not possess absolute authority over their students. Students in school as well as out of school are "persons" under our Constitution. In the absence of a specific showing of constitutionally valid reasons to regulate their speech, students are entitled to freedom of expression of their views. . . .

### Questions to Consider:

1. In the majority opinion, the Court recognized the need to balance the specific rights in conflict in this case. What rights are in conflict here?
2. According to the decision, what must a school prove in order to justify a rule prohibiting its students' rights to free speech?
3. Students in the Des Moines schools were permitted to wear other symbols of political statements such as presidential campaign buttons. Why was this significant to the Court?
4. In light of this decision, what are some situations when the Supreme Court of the United States might allow the school district to restrict students' free speech?

Taken from <http://www.landmarkcases.org/tinker/background2.html>

