

The Zinn Reader  
Writings on Disobedience  
and Democracy

Howard Zinn

Seven Stories Press/New York

Copyright © 1997 by Howard Zinn

A Seven Stories Press First Edition

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, by any means, including mechanical, electric, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

In the U.K.:

Turnaround Publisher Services Ltd., Unit 3, Olympia Trading Estate,  
Coburg Road, Wood Green, London N22 6TZ U.K.

In Canada:

Hushion House, 36 Northline Road, Toronto, Ontario M4B 3E2, Canada

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Zinn, Howard, 1922-

[Essays. Selections]

The Zinn reader: writings on disobedience and democracy /

Howard Zinn—Seven Stories press 1st ed.

p. cm.

ISBN 1-888363-53-3 (cloth). —ISBN 1-888363-54-1 (pbk.)

1. United States—History. 2. United States—Politics and government. 3. United States—Social conditions. I. Title.

E178.6.Z552 1997

973—dc21

97-24778

CIP

Seven Stories Press  
632 Broadway, 7th Floor  
New York, NY 10012

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the U.S.A.

# 3

## The Bill of Rights

I was one of the speakers at historic Faneuil Hall in Boston (though named after an early slave trader, it was the scene of many meetings of anti-slavery groups before the Civil War) in 1991, when the Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts organized a celebration of the Bicentennial of the Bill of Rights. I wanted to use the opportunity to make clear that whatever freedoms we have in the United States—of speech, of the press, of assembly, and more—do not come simply from the existence on paper of the first ten Amendments to the Constitution, but from the struggles of citizens to bring those Amendments alive in reality. My talk was reprinted in the book *Failure to Quit: Reflections of an Optimistic Historian* (Common Courage Press, 1993).

**A** few years back, a man high up in the CIA named Ray Cline was asked if the CIA, by its surveillance of protest organizations in the United States, was violating the free speech provision of the First Amendment. He smiled and said: "It's only an Amendment."

And when it was disclosed that the FBI was violating citizens' rights repeatedly, a high official of the FBI was asked if anybody in the FBI questioned the legality of what they were doing. He replied: "No, we never gave it a thought."

We clearly cannot expect the Bill of Rights to be defended by government officials. So it will have to be defended by the people.

If you do a bit of research into the origins of the Bill of Rights—and I had to do some because it is a job requirement of the historical profession—you will find that when the new government of the United States adopted the Bill of Rights in 1791, it did not do so with enthusiasm. The Bill of Rights was a political tool to quiet down critics of the Constitution. A Bill of Rights on paper comforts people. You don't have to take it seriously. Like that CIA man, you can smile, and say, they're only Amendments.

Well, in 1791, the first ten Amendments—the Bill of Rights—were added to the Constitution, and the First Amendment says, among other things: "Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press..." Seven years later, in 1798, Congress passed a law abridging the freedom of speech and the press. It was the Sedition Act of 1798, and it provided jail sentences for people who criticized the government. A number of writers and speakers were imprisoned. They appealed to the court. Now we all learned in junior high school about checks and balances and how if Congress passes a law violating the Constitution, we are very lucky to have the Supreme Court to check that and declare the law null and void. (I was always proud to know such a fancy phrase, "null and void.")

Well, the members of the Supreme Court, apparently having skipped junior high school, or perhaps understanding that the phrase "checks and balances" is just intended to satisfy schoolchildren—did not declare the Sedition Act null and void. Not at all. They said it was constitutional. You may ask: by what legal philosophy can Supreme Court justices explain how Congress can pass a law abridging the freedom of speech when the Constitution says Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech? I could tell you how they did that; but it would take a while and cause indigestion. Let us just say that legal training is a wonderful thing, it enables you to explain the unexplainable, defend the indefensible, and rationalize the irrational.

Paul Hall in Boston (though the scene of many meetings during the Civil War) in 1991, when they organized a celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights. I had to use the opportunity to talk about the Bill of Rights in the United States—more—do not come simultaneously. The first ten Amendments to the Constitution are reprinted in the book *Common Law* by the *Historian* (Common

A CIA named Ray Cline was one of the first to name the protest organizations in the name of the speech provision of the First Amendment.

It seems that especially in time of war or near-war (and in 1798 it was such a time), the First Amendment is ignored. You may have noticed that the year 1991 did not start with a celebration of the Bill of Rights, but with a war. And that the government established control over information and the mass media became tongue-tied with patriotic fervor, and the First Amendment was bombed into oblivion. It is a truism of our political culture: if you are at war for freedom and democracy, you can't have freedom and democracy. So, exactly when free speech is most needed, that is, when it is a matter of life and death for the young people about to be sent to the battlefield—exactly at such a moment the government declares it can be suspended.

In 1917, as armies of young men in Europe were slaughtering one another in the first World War, and the United States decided to send its own young men into the butchery, Congress passed the Espionage Act, and the Sedition Act, providing heavy sentences for those criticizing the war. The Supreme Court again put our junior high school lesson to shame: checks and balances? Not in wartime. Not when you need them. The great liberal Oliver Wendell Holmes himself wrote the opinions affirming the constitutionality of the Espionage Act, sending a man named Schenck to jail for distributing a leaflet criticizing the war and the draft. Two thousand people were prosecuted for speaking or writing against the war, including Eugene Debs, the great labor leader and Socialist.

There were ludicrous episodes in all that. A filmmaker who made a movie about the American Revolution was sent to prison for ten years because the movie portrayed the British as the enemy in the American Revolution, and now the British were our allies in the war. The name of the movie was *The Spirit of '76* and the title of the court case against the filmmaker was *U.S. v. Spirit of '76*.

And that case sums up the relationship of the government to the Bill of Rights: *U.S. v. Spirit of '76*. It was the President of the United States, Harry Truman, who instituted loyalty oaths even before Joseph McCarthy waved his lists of Communists in the State Department. It was the Congress of the United States, Democrats as well as Republicans, that set up the House Un-American Activities Committee, and voted contempt citations against people who refused to bow down to that Committee. It was the Supreme Court that affirmed the convictions of

of war or near-war (and in 1798  
ment is ignored. You may have  
with a celebration of the Bill of  
ernment established control over  
e tongue-tied with patriotic fer-  
bed into oblivion. It is a truism  
for freedom and democracy, you  
xactly when free speech is most  
and death for the young people  
tly at such a moment the gov-

n Europe were slaughtering one  
nited States decided to send its  
ress passed the Espionage Act,  
tences for those criticizing the  
junior high school lesson to  
ne. Not when you need them.  
; himself wrote the opinions  
sionage Act, sending a man  
let criticizing the war and the  
ted for speaking or writing  
the great labor leader and

that. A filmmaker who made  
s sent to prison for ten years  
the enemy in the American  
lies in the war. The name of  
of the court case against the

up of the government to the  
the President of the United  
by oaths even before Joseph  
the State Department. It was  
as well as Republicans, that  
Committee, and voted con-  
down to that  
the convictions of

the Hollywood Ten for invoking the First Amendment. It was Republicans and Democrats, it was all three branches of government, all of them swearing to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and all of them violating that oath.

A word about the Supreme Court. We now have nine conserva-  
tive justices, including one conservative woman and one conservative  
black man. It's called American pluralism. Many people have been  
depressed over this. Frankly, I tried to get depressed, but didn't succeed.  
Sure, it's better to have a liberal Supreme Court. But the Supreme Court  
at its most liberal has never been a dependable protector of people's rights.  
One year it will say you have a constitutional right to distribute leaflets in  
front of a supermarket. Another year it will say you can go to jail for that.  
One year it will say: high school students have a right to wear black arm-  
bands to protest a war. Another year it will say: high school students don't  
have the right to put out their own newspapers without censorship by the  
school authorities. The Supreme Court, when it was liberal, affirmed that  
Japanese-Americans could be put in concentration camps because we  
were at war. The Supreme Court, liberal or conservative, sworn to defend  
the Constitution, has never been a bulwark against unconstitutional wars.

If it were left to the institutions of government, the Bill of Rights  
would be left for dead. But someone breathed life into the Bill of Rights.  
Ordinary people did it, by doing extraordinary things. The editors and  
speakers who, in spite of the Sedition Act of 1798, continued to criticize  
the government. The black and white abolitionists who defied the  
Fugitive Slave Law, defied the Supreme Court's *Dred Scott* decision, who  
insisted that black people were human beings, not property, and who  
broke into courtrooms and police stations to rescue them, to prevent their  
return to slavery.

Women, who were arrested again and again as they spoke out for  
their right to control their own bodies, or the right to vote. Members of  
the Industrial Workers of the World, anarchists, radicals, who filled the  
jails in California and Idaho and Montana until they were finally allowed  
to speak to working people. Socialists and pacifists and anarchists like  
Helen Keller and Rose Pastor Stokes, and Kate O'Hare and Emma  
Goldman, who defied the government and denounced war in 1917 and  
1918. The artists and writers and labor organizers and Communists—  
Dalton Trumbo and Pete Seeger, and W.E.B. Du Bois and Paul Robeson,

who challenged the congressional committees of the 1950s, challenged the FBI, at the risk of their freedom and their careers.

In the 1960s, the students of Kent State and Jackson State and hundreds of other campuses, the draft resisters and deserters, the priests and nuns and lay people, all the marchers and demonstrators and trespassers who demanded that the killing in Vietnam stop, the GIs in the Mekong Delta who refused to go out on patrol, the B52 pilots who refused to fly in the Christmas bombing of 1972, the Vietnam veterans who gathered in Washington and threw their Purple Hearts and other medals over a fence in protest against the war.

And after the war, in the '70s and '80s, those courageous few who carried on, the Berrigans and all like them who continued to demonstrate against the war machine, the Seabrook fence climbers, the signers of the Pledge of Resistance against U.S. military action in Central America, the gays and lesbians who marched in the streets for the first time, challenging the country to recognize their humanity, the disabled people who spoke up, after a long silence, demanding their rights. The Indians, supposed to be annihilated and gone from the scene, emerging ghostlike, to occupy a tiny portion of the land that was taken from them, Wounded Knee, South Dakota. Saying: we're not gone, we're here, and we want you to listen to us.

These are the people, men, women, children, of all colors and national origins, who gave life to the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights was expanded after the Civil War, with the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, to apply to the states, to prevent them from keeping slavery, to require that they give all people, regardless of race or color, the equal protection of the laws. But these amendments were soon ignored, as blacks were kept in semi-slavery in the South, segregated, humiliated, beaten, lynched by mobs, unprotected by either the local police or the national government. For almost a hundred years after the 14th Amendment became law, every President, whether liberal or conservative, Republican or Democrat, violated his oath of office, his pledge to uphold the Constitution, by failing to enforce those Amendments. And the Supreme Court interpreted them so as to make them useless.

And so black people in the South, in the most dangerous towns and cities in the country, decided to give life to the 14th Amendment, at

of the 1950s, challenged  
 eers.  
 and Jackson State and  
 nd deserters, the priests  
 demonstrators and tres-  
 um stop, the GIs in the  
 ol, the B52 pilots who  
 t, the Vietnam veterans  
 urple Hearts and other

ose courageous few who  
 ntinued to demonstrate  
 bers, the signers of the  
 n Central America, the  
 he first time, challeng-  
 e disabled people who  
 ghts. The Indians, sup-  
 emerging ghostlike, to  
 from them, Wounded  
 here, and we want you

For many people there were not even words—not for working  
 people, women, gays and lesbians, disabled people. The Bill of Rights says  
 nothing about the right to work, to a decent wage, to housing, to health  
 care, to the rights of women, to the right of privacy in sexual preference,  
 to the rights of people with disabilities.

But we don't need permission from on high, words approved by  
 the authorities, to tell us that certain truths are self-evident, as the  
 Declaration of Independence put it. That we are all created equal, that we  
 all have rights that cannot be taken from us, the rights to life, liberty, and  
 the pursuit of happiness. And so working people went on strike thousands  
 of times, were beaten and killed on the picket line, until they won an  
 eight-hour day, and a bit of economic security. Women created a nation-  
 al movement that changed the consciousness of millions of people. Gays  
 and lesbians, disabled people, organized, spoke up, declared: we exist, we  
 must be paid attention to. And people began to pay attention.

We should look beyond the Bill of Rights to the UN's Universal  
 Declaration of Human Rights, which says that all people, everywhere in  
 the world, are entitled to work and decent wages, to holidays and vaca-  
 tions, to food and clothing and housing and medical care, to education,  
 to child care and maternal care.

The guarantees of the Bill of Rights have little meaning so long  
 as we have a class society with enormous differences of wealth and  
 income. The rights of free speech and press depend on having the  
 resources to use them. The right to legal counsel is different for rich and  
 poor. The right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures is dif-

dren, of all colors and  
 s.

Civil War, with the pas-  
 apply to the states, to  
 at they give all people,  
 of the laws. But these  
 t in semi-slavery in the  
 mobs, unprotected by  
 For almost a hundred  
 ery President, whether  
 t, violated his oath of  
 failing to enforce those  
 ed them so as to make

most dangerous towns  
 he 14th Amendment, at



ferent for a family living in a mansion and another living in a housing project, or out on the street.

In the real world, the fate of human beings is decided every day not by the courts, but out of court, in the streets, in the workplace, by whoever has the wealth and power. The redistribution of that wealth and power is necessary if the Bill of Rights, if any rights, are to have meaning.

The novelist Aldous Huxley once said: "Liberties are not given; they are taken." We are not given our liberties by the Bill of Rights, certainly not by the government which either violates or ignores those rights. We take our rights, as thinking, acting citizens.

And so we should celebrate today, not the words of the Bill of Rights, certainly not the political leaders who utter those words and violate them every day. We should celebrate, honor, all those people who risked their jobs, their freedom, sometimes their lives, to affirm the rights we all have, rights not limited to some document, but rights our common sense tells us we should all have as human beings. Who should, for example, we celebrate?

I think of Lillian Gobitis, from Lynn, Massachusetts, a seventh-grade student who, back in 1935, because of her religious convictions, refused to salute the American flag even when she was suspended from school.

And Mary Beth Tinker, a thirteen-year-old girl in Des Moines, Iowa, who in 1965 went to school wearing a black armband in protest against the killing of people in Vietnam, and defied the school authorities even when they suspended her.

An unnamed black boy, nine years old, arrested in Albany, Georgia, in 1961 for marching in a parade against racial segregation after the police said this was unlawful. He stood in line to be booked by the police chief, who was startled to see this little boy and asked him: "What's your name?" And he replied: "Freedom, freedom."

I think of Gordon Hirabayashi, born in Seattle of Japanese parents, who, at the start of the war between Japan and the United States, refused to obey the curfew directed against all of Japanese ancestry, and refused to be evacuated to a detention camp, and insisted on his freedom, despite an executive order by the President and a decision of the Supreme Court.

Demetrio Rodriguez of San Antonio, who in 1968 spoke up and said his child, living in a poor county, had a right to a good education equal to that of a child living in a rich county.

All those alternative newspapers and alternative radio stations and struggling organizations that have tried to give meaning to free speech by giving information that the mass media will not give, revealing information that the government wants kept secret.

All those whistleblowers, who risked their jobs, risked prison, defying their employers, whether the government or corporations, to tell the truth about nuclear weapons, or chemical poisoning.

Randy Kehler and Betsy Corner, who have refused to pay taxes to support the war machine, and all their neighbors who, when the government decided to seize and auction their house, refused to bid, and so they are still defending their right.

The 550 people who occupied the JFK Federal Building in Boston in protest when President Reagan declared a blockade of Nicaragua. I was in that group—I don't mind getting arrested when I have company—and the official charge against us used the language of the old trespass law: "failure to quit the premises." On the letter I got dropping the case (because there were too many of us to deal with), they shortened that charge to "failure to quit."

I think that sums up what it is that has kept the Bill of Rights alive. Not the President or Congress, or the Supreme Court, or the wealthy media. But all those people who have refused to quit, who have insisted on their rights and the rights of others, the rights of all human beings everywhere, whether Americans or Haitians or Chinese or Russians or Iraqis or Israelis or Palestinians, to equality, to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is the spirit of the Bill of Rights, and beyond that, the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, yes, the spirit of '76: refusal to quit.

and another living in a housing

man beings is decided every day  
the streets, in the workplace, by  
the redistribution of that wealth  
rights, if any rights, are to have

ce said: "Liberties are not given;  
berties by the Bill of Rights, cer-  
er violates or ignores those rights.  
itizens.

ay, not the words of the Bill of  
who utter those words and vio-  
e, honor, all those people who  
es their lives, to affirm the rights  
ument, but rights our common  
beings. Who should, for exam-

ynn, Massachusetts, a seventh-  
se of her religious convictions,  
when she was suspended from

1-year-old girl in Des Moines,  
ing a black armband in protest  
id defied the school authorities

ears old, arrested in Albany,  
against racial segregation after  
d in line to be booked by the  
le boy and asked him: "What's  
edom."

rn in Seattle of Japanese par-  
Japan and the United States,  
t all of Japanese ancestry, and  
s, and insisted on his freedom,  
and a decision of the Supreme