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**Essential Question of the Case:**

Does a ban against the wearing of armbands in public school, as a form of symbolic protest, violate the First Amendment's freedom of speech protections?

**Background**

John and Mary Beth Tinker attended public school in Des Moines, Iowa in 1965. Their school did not allow students to wear armbands to protest the Vietnam War. However, the Tinkers decided to wear armbands to school anyway. The school officials asked the Tinkers to remove their armbands, but the Tinkers refused. John and Mary Beth Tinker were suspended from school until they agreed to remove the armbands.

The Tinkers’ parents sued the school district in the U.S. District Court. Mr. and Mrs. Tinker believed that the Des Moines school district violated their right to free speech under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Even though the students were not speaking with their voices, they believed that wearing armbands was like speaking. This is called symbolic speech.

The District Court sided with the school officials. The Court said that wearing the armbands could disrupt learning at the school. Learning without disruption was more important than the free speech of the students.

The Tinkers appealed their case to the next level of courts, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, but the Circuit Court agreed with the District Court. The Tinkers then appealed their case to the U.S. Supreme Court.

**Constitutional Principles Related to the Case**

**1st Amendment (1791)**

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

**14th Amendment (1868)**

**SECTION. 1.** All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.
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**Decision & Impact**

In a 7-2 decision, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Tinkers. Associate Justice Fortas wrote the majority opinion, ruling that students retain their constitutional right of freedom of speech while in public school.

The Court ruled that students are entitled to exercise their constitutional rights, even while in school. The justices reasoned that neither “students (n)or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate.” Because student expression is protected by the First Amendment even while in school, school officials must provide constitutionally valid reasons for limiting student expression.

The reason for limiting expression must be more than a desire to avoid having students express unpopular viewpoints and school officials must show that the expression would cause a substantial disruption to the school environment. The Court decided that allowing the Tinkers to wear their armbands protesting the Vietnam conflict would not “substantially interfere with the work of the school or impinge [invade] upon the rights of other students.” Wearing the armbands was a “silent, passive expression of opinion” that did not involve any “disorder or disturbance,” and was unlikely to cause a major disruption in the school. The decision also noted that the school officials specifically targeted anti-war armbands, but did not forbid the wearing of any other symbols conveying a political message.

Tinker v. Des Moines set the legal precedent that students keep some of their First Amendment rights while in school and for school officials to deny these rights, they must show a substantial impact on the school and learning environment.
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**Essential Question of the Case:**

Did the principal's deletion of the articles violate the students' rights under the First Amendment?

**Background**

The journalism class at Hazelwood East High School wrote articles and put them together for the school paper. They gave the newspaper to their teacher, Howard Emerson. Mr. Emerson showed the newspaper to the principal. He asked the principal if it was okay to make copies and hand them out to students at the school.

Principal Reynolds did not like what he read. First, there was an article about pregnant students. It described the students, but it did not give their names. Principal Reynolds was afraid that students would be able to figure out who the pregnant students were.

There was another article that Principal Reynolds did not like. This one talked about divorce. In it, one student said things about her father. For example, she said that her father went out too much. She also said that her father didn't spend enough time with his family. The father did not get a chance to tell his side of the story. Principal Reynolds thought this was unfair.

Principal Reynolds thought the paper needed to be changed. But it was almost the end of the school year. He was afraid that it would take the class a long time to change it. If it took too long, the school year would be over and the other students would not get the paper. So he told Mr. Emerson to remove the pages that had the articles about pregnancy and divorce. He said to make copies of the rest of the paper.

The students were very angry. They had spent a lot of time writing the articles. They could have fixed them if Principal Reynolds had given them a chance. Instead, he deleted two pages that also contained other articles. They believed that this was a violation of their First Amendment rights. They went to the U.S. District Court. That court did not agree with them. It said that school officials may limit student speech in the school newspaper if their decision has "a substantial and reasonable basis." In other words, if he has a good reason, it is okay for a principal to limit student speech.

The students appealed the decision. The Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the U.S. District Court. This court said that the school paper was a "public forum," or place where students could express their views. The judges said that the school could not edit the paper except "to avoid . . . substantial interference with school work or discipline . . . or the rights of others." They did not think that the articles about pregnancy would have interfered with schoolwork. They thought the articles should have been printed.

The school appealed the decision of the Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to hear the case.
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**Constitutional Principle Related to the Case**

**1st Amendment (1791)**

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

**Decision & Impact**

The Supreme Court ruled against the students in a 5-3 decision. Associate Justice White wrote the majority opinion, concluding that the First Amendment does not prevent school officials from using reasonable authority over the content of school-sponsored publications. The public school and its attached rules will govern over what can be produced by any publication associated with the school. Therefore, a school may not need to completely follow the First Amendment.

The majority opinion first discussed whether school-sponsored student newspapers are public forums. If they were public forums, school officials would not be allowed to exercise editorial control over the content of the paper. Referring to Supreme Court precedent, the decision noted that school facilities are only considered to be public forums when school authorities have “’by policy or by practice’ opened those facilities for use by the general public. If the facilities are used for other purposes, however, they do not constitute a public forum, and “school officials may impose reasonable restrictions on the speech of students.” The school newspaper in this case was not open to the entire student body, teachers and other members of the community, but was instead published as part of the curriculum of a journalism class. Therefore, its primary function was for educational purposes, and the newspaper did not constitute a public forum.

The Court determined that the First Amendment rights of students in public schools are not necessarily equal to those of adults outside of schools and that schools can limit speech that conflicts with the mission of the school. School officials have authority and control over publications, such as school newspapers, to make sure that the educational lesson is taught and readers are not exposed to possibly inappropriate material. As long as the editing control of school officials was related to educational concerns, it did not violate the First Amendment. This case was the second major case dealing with First Amendment rights in schools and set a precedent of determining how school officials could legally limit students’ First Amendment rights.
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Name of Case: *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_* Year: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**1. What is the essential question of this case?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**2. Using the evidence you found during your reading, summarize the background of this case in three complete sentences.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**3 What is the constitutional principle(s) related to the case? List the principle and summarize the meaning below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**4. How did the Court answer the essential question? What was the reason for their decision?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**5. What was the impact of this case on society?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**6. Why is this case considered a landmark?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
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