

## **Texas v. Johnson / Background •••—Answer Key**

Gregory Lee Johnson participated in a political demonstration during the Republican National Convention in Dallas, Texas, in 1984. The purpose of the demonstration was to protest policies of the Reagan Administration and of certain corporations based in Dallas. Demonstrators marched through the streets, chanted slogans, and held protests outside the offices of several corporations. At one point, another demonstrator handed Johnson an American flag.

When the demonstrators reached Dallas City Hall, Johnson doused the flag with kerosene and set it on fire. During the burning of the flag, the demonstrators shouted, “America, the red, white, and blue, we spit on you.” No one was hurt or threatened with injury, but some witnesses to the flag burning said they were seriously offended. One witness picked up the flag’s charred remains and buried them in his backyard.

Johnson was charged with the desecration of a venerated object, in violation of the Texas Penal Code. He was convicted, sentenced to one year in prison, and fined \$2,000. He appealed his conviction to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth District of Texas, which let his conviction stand. He then appealed to the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, which is the highest court in Texas that hears criminal cases. That court overturned his conviction saying that the state could not punish Johnson for burning the flag in these circumstances because it was not consistent with the First Amendment.

The Criminal Appeals Court first found that Johnson’s burning of the flag was expressive conduct protected by the First Amendment. Therefore, in order for a state to criminalize or regulate such conduct it would have to serve a compelling state interest that would outweigh the protection of the First Amendment. The court concluded that making flag desecration illegal in order to preserve the flag as a symbol of national unity was not a compelling enough interest to survive the constitutional challenge. It also decided that while preventing breaches of the peace qualified as a compelling state interest, the law was not drawn narrowly enough to only punish those flag burnings that would likely result in a serious disturbance. Further, it stressed that another Texas statute prohibited breaches of the peace and could serve the same purpose of preventing disturbances without punishing this flag desecration.

The court said, “Recognizing that the right to differ is the centerpiece of our First Amendment freedoms . . . a government cannot mandate by fiat a feeling of unity in its citizens. Therefore that very same government cannot carve out a symbol of unity and prescribe a set of approved messages to be associated with that symbol . . . .” The court also concluded that the flag burning in this case did not cause or threaten to cause a breach of the peace.

The state of Texas filed a petition for a writ of *certiorari* and, in 1988, the Supreme Court of the United States agreed to hear the case. In 1989, the Court handed down its decision.

## Questions to Consider

1. The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states: “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.” What part of the Amendment is relevant to this case?

The part of the First Amendment that is relevant to the case is "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech . . . or the right of the people to peaceably assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." [The Court has held that the 14th Amendment makes the First Amendment applicable to the States.]

2. What do you think is meant by “symbolic speech?” What are some other examples?  
"Symbolic speech" refers to actions that express an opinion. One example is burning a draft card. Another is wearing a black armband or a cross.
3. What argument could you make that flag burning threatens to cause violence and, therefore, should be against the law?

The First Amendment protects freedom of speech and the right of the people to "peaceably assemble." People view flag burning as inflammatory and offensive, so there is always a possibility they will react violently. The state has a duty to protect the safety and well-being of its citizens and an action which incites violence should be prohibited. In Johnson's case the demonstration was not peaceable and though it did not result in violence or injury in this instance, the possibility was still there.

4. What arguments could you make that the First Amendment should protect flag burning?  
Speech is not limited to the spoken or written word, but it includes actions as well. Flag burning is one of these actions that falls in the category of political expression. Some people find it offensive, but that is even more reason why it should be protected. The Constitution must protect all forms of speech, especially those that are unpopular.
5. How should the Supreme Court of the United States decide this case? Why?

Student answers will vary as a case could be made in favor of either side. One could argue that the Court should rule in favor of Gregory Johnson on the grounds that flag burning is a form of expression protected by the First Amendment. The government has no right to mandate what people believe. Johnson's was an unpopular opinion, but that is all the more reason that he should be allowed to express it. His actions were not disruptive, nor did they threaten to harm anyone. Allowing people to practice freedom is more important than protecting the flag, which simply symbolizes freedom. On the other hand, one could argue that the Court should rule in favor of Texas on the grounds that flag burning is antagonistic and could provoke people to behave violently. This was not the only method he had of expressing his opinion and the government was not opposed to the opinion itself but to the manner in which he expressed it. Furthermore, the flag is an important national symbol that must be revered and respected. If the government mandates that people cannot desecrate the flag, the law is controlling people's actions and not their opinions.