ESSAY ON CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Henry David Thoreau

Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862) was a citizen of Concord, Massachusetts, where he lived during the middle of the 19th century. He was a good friend of various literary figures of the day, including Ralph Waldo Emerson, one of the most eminent of American authors and a popular orator.

The incident from which the following essay arose was a night that Thoreau spent in jail for refusing to pay taxes to the government. He was later asked to give a talk about his experiences in jail to the Concord Lyceum on January 26, 1848, and this talk was then committed to paper and published in an obscure journal, where it was promptly forgotten.

Although Thoreau’s writing achieved little fame during his lifetime, his essay on civil disobedience was later “re-discovered” by Mohandas Gandhi, who came across it while studying law at Oxford as a young man. Gandhi later used the essay as a foundation for his efforts in India resisting the British government through civil disobedience. Through Gandhi, Thoreau’s work also became known to Martin Luther King, who made use of it during his resistance in the 1960’s to the racial segregation laws in the United States.

Thoreau is probably best known in the United States for his longer work Walden, in which he recounts his two-year stay at Walden pond. But internationally, Thoreau’s fame rests on the brief essay printed in abridged form below which, although of little consequence in his own day, went on to transform our view of the political world.

I HEARTILY accept the motto — “That government is best which governs least”; and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically.¹ Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe — “That government is best which governs not at all”; and when men are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government which they will have. Government is at best but an expedient; but most governments are usually, and all governments are sometimes, inexpedient. The objections which have been brought against a standing army, and they are many and weighty, and deserve to prevail, may also at last be brought against a standing government. The standing army is only an arm of the standing government. The government itself, which is only the mode which the people have chosen to execute their will, is equally liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it. Witness the present Mexican war,² the work of comparatively a few individuals using the standing government as their tool; for, in the outset, the people would not have consented to this measure.

[...] The practical reason why, when the power is once in the hands of the people, a majority are permitted, and for a long period continue, to rule, is not because they are most likely to be in the right, nor because this seems fairest to the minority, but because they are physically the strongest. But a government in which the majority rule in all cases cannot be based on justice, even as far as men understand it. Can there not be a government in which majorities do not virtually decide right and wrong, but conscience? — in which majorities decide only those questions to which the rule of expediency is applicable? Must the citizen ever for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every man a conscience, then? I think that we should be men first, and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right. The only obligation which I have a right to assume, is to do at any time what I think right. It is truly enough said, that a corporation has no conscience; but a corporation of conscientious men is a corporation with a conscience. Law never made men a whit more just; and, by means of their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily

¹ [Thoreau may have been quoting John L. O’Sullivan: “Understood as a central consolidated power, managing and directing the various general interests of the society, all government is evil, and the parent of evil…. The best government is that which governs least.” — from his Introduction to The United States Magazine and Democratic Review (1837).]

² [The Mexican War began in March of 1846 and ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (signed February 2, 1848). The immediate causes of the war were the annexation of Texas by the United States, and the desire by the United States to purchase present-day California and New Mexico. The Mexican government refused to sell their land, so the U.S. government took it by armed force.]
made the agents of injustice. […]

How does it become a man to behave toward this American government today? I answer that he cannot without disgrace be associated with it. I cannot for an instant recognize that political organization as my government which is the slave’s government also.

All men recognize the right of revolution; that is, the right to refuse allegiance to and to resist the government, when its tyranny or its inefficiency are great and undurable. But almost all say that such is not the case now. But such was the case, they think, in the Revolution of ’75. If one were to tell me that this was a bad government because it taxed foreign commodities brought to its ports, it is most probable that I should not make an ado about it, for I can do without them; all machines have their friction; and possibly this does enough good to counterbalance the evil. At any rate, it is a great evil to make a stir about it. But when the friction comes to have its machine, and oppression and robbery are organized, I say, let us not have such a machine any longer. In other words, when a sixth of the population of a nation which has undertaken to be the refuge of liberty are slaves, and a whole country is unjustly overrun and conquered by a foreign army, and subjected to military law, I think that it is not too soon for honest men to rebel and revolutionize. What makes this duty the more urgent is the fact, that the country so is not our own, but ours is the invaded slavery and to the war, who yet in effect do nothing to make war on Mexico, though it cost them their existence as a people. […]

Practically speaking, the opponents to a reform in Massachusetts are not a hundred thousand politicians in the South, but a hundred thousand merchants and farmers here, who are more interested in commerce and agriculture than they are in humanity, and are not prepared to do justice to the slave and to Mexico, cost what it may. I quarrel not with far-off foes, but with those who, near at home, co-operate with, and do the bidding of those far away, and without whom the latter would be harmless. We are accustomed to say, that the mass of men are unprepared; but improvement is slow, because the few are not materially wiser or better than the many. It is not so important that many should be as good as you, as that there be some absolute goodness somewhere; for that will leaven the whole lump. There are thousands who are in opinion opposed to slavery and to the war, who yet in effect do nothing to put an end to them; who, esteeming themselves children of Washington and Franklin, sit down with their hands in their pockets, and say that they know not what to do, and do nothing; who even postpone the question of freedom to the question of free-trade, and quietly read the prices-current along with the latest advices from Mexico, after dinner, and, it may be, fall asleep over them both. What is the price-current of an honest man and patriot today? They hesitate, and they regret, and sometimes they petition; but they do nothing in earnest and with effect. They will wait, well disposed, for others to remedy the evil, that they may no longer have it to regret. At most, they give only a cheap vote, and a feeble countenance and Godspeed, to the right, as it

3 [Thoreau is referring to the American Revolution; the fighting began in Concord on 19 April 1775.]
4 [Thoreau refers here to the then current practice of slavery in the southern states, and to the aggressions by the United States against Mexico.]
5 [William Paley (1743-1805), English theologian and moral philosopher. Thoreau is referring to chapter six of Paley’s *The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (1785).]
6 [Matthew 10:39]
7 [I Corinthians 5:6.]
goes by them. There are nine hundred and ninety-nine patrons of virtue to one virtuous man; but it is easier to deal with the real possessor of a thing than with the temporary guardian of it.

All voting is a sort of gaming, like checkers or backgammon, with a slight moral tinge to it, a playing with right and wrong, with moral questions; and betting naturally accompanies it. The character of the voters is not staked. I cast my vote, perchance, as I think right; but I am not vitally concerned that that right should prevail. I am willing to leave it to the majority. Its obligation, therefore, never exceeds that of expediency. Even voting for the right is doing nothing for it. It is only expressing to men feebly your desire that it should prevail. A wise man will not leave the right to the mercy of chance, nor wish it to prevail through the power of the majority. There is but little virtue in the action of masses of men. When the majority shall at length vote for the abolition of slavery, it will be because they are indifferent to slavery, or because there is but little slavery left to be abolished by their vote. They will then be the only slaves. Only his vote can hasten the abolition of slavery who asserts his own freedom by his vote. […]

It is not a man’s duty, as a matter of course, to devote himself to the eradication of any, even the most enormous wrong; he may still properly have other concerns to engage him; but it is his duty, at least, to wash his hands of it, and, if he gives it no thought longer, not to give it practically his support. If I devote myself to other pursuits and contemplations, I must first see, at least, that I do not pursue them sitting upon another man’s shoulders. I must get off him first, that he may pursue his contemplations too. See what gross inconsistency is tolerated. I have heard some of my townsmen say, “I should like to have them order me out to help put down an insurrection of the slaves, or to march to Mexico — see if I would go”; and yet these very men have each, directly by their allegiance, and so indirectly, at least, by their money, furnished a substitute. The soldier is applauded who refuses to serve in an unjust war by those who do not refuse to sustain the unjust government which makes the war; is applauded by those whose own act and authority he disregards and sets at nought; as if the State were penitent to that degree that it hired one to scourge it while it sinned, but not to that degree that it left off sinning for a moment.

Thus, under the name of order and civil government, we are all made at last to pay homage to and support our own meanness. After the first blush of sin, comes its indifference; and from immoral it becomes, as it were, unmoral, and not quite unnecessary to that life which we have made. […]

Unjust laws exist; shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavor to amend them, and obey them until we have succeeded, or shall we transgress them at once? Men generally, under such a government as this, think that they ought to wait until they have persuaded the majority to alter them. They think that, if they should resist, the remedy would be worse than the evil. But it is the fault of the government itself that the remedy is worse than the evil. It makes it worse. Why is it not more apt to anticipate and provide for reform? Why does it not cherish its wise minority? Why does it cry and resist before it is hurt? Why does it not encourage its citizens to be on the alert to point out its faults, and do better than it would have them? Why does it always crucify Christ, and excommunicate Copernicus and Luther, and pronounce Washington and Franklin rebels? […]

If the injustice is part of the necessary friction of the machine of government, let it go, let it go; perchance it will wear smooth — certainly the machine will wear out. If the injustice has a spring, or a pulley, or a rope, or a crank, exclusively for itself, then perhaps you may consider whether the remedy will not be worse than the evil; but if it is of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law. Let your life be a counter friction to stop the machine. What I have to do is to see, at any rate, that I do not lend myself to the wrong which I condemn. […]

I meet this American government, or its representative the State government, directly, and face to face, once a year, no more, in the person of its tax-gatherer; this is the only mode in which a man situated as I am necessarily meets it; and it then says distinctly, Recognize me; and the simplest, the most effectual, and, in the present posture of affairs, the indispensabllest mode of treating with it on this head, of expressing your little satisfaction with and love for it, is to deny it then. My civil neighbor, the tax-gatherer, is the very man I have to deal with — for it is, after all, with men and not with parchment that I quarrel — and he has voluntarily chosen to be an agent of the government. How shall he
ever know well what he is and does as an officer of the
government, or as a man, until he is obliged to consider
whether he shall treat me, his neighbor, for whom he
has respect, as a neighbor and well-disposed man, or as
a maniac and disturber of the peace, and see if he can
get over this obstruction to his neighborliness without a
ruder and more impetuous thought or speech corre-
sponding with his action? I know this well, that if one
thousand, if one hundred, if ten men whom I could
name — if ten honest men only — aye, if one honest
man, in this State of Massachusetts, ceasing to hold
slaves, were actually to withdraw from this co-partner-
ship, and be locked up in the county jail therefore, it
would be the abolition of slavery in America. For it
matters not how small the beginning may seem to be:
what is once well done is done for ever. But we love
to talk about it: that, we say, is our mission.
Reform keeps many scores of newspapers in its service,
but not one man. […]

Under a government which imprisons any unjustly,
the true place for a just man is also a prison. The prop-
er place today, the only place which Massachusetts has
provided for her freer and less desponding spirits, is in
her prisons, to be put out and locked out of the State by
her own act, as they have already put themselves out by
their principles. It is there that the fugitive slave, and
the Mexican prisoner on parole, and the Indian come to
plead the wrongs of his race should find them; on that
separate, but more free and honorable ground, where
the State places those who are not with her but against
her — the only house in a slave-state in which a free
man can abide with honor. If any think that their influ-
ence would be lost there, and their voices no longer
afflict the ear of the State, that they would not be as an
enemy within its walls, they do not know by how much
truth is stronger than error, nor how much more elo-
quently and effectively he can combat injustice who has
experienced a little in his own person. Cast your whole
vote, not a strip of paper merely, but your whole in-
fluence. A minority is powerless while it conforms to
the majority; it is not even a minority then; but it is
irresistible when it clogs by its whole weight. If the
alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up
war and slavery, the State will not hesitate which to
choose. If a thousand men were not to pay their tax-
bills this year, that would not be a violent and bloody
measure, as it would be to pay them, and enable the
State to commit violence and shed innocent blood. This
is, in fact, the definition of a peaceable revolution, if
any such is possible. If the tax-gatherer, or any other
public officer, asks me, as one has done, “But what
shall I do?” my answer is, “If you really wish to do any
thing, resign your office.” When the subject has
refused allegiance, and the officer has resigned his
office, then the revolution is accomplished. But even
suppose blood should flow. Is there not a sort of blood
shed when the conscience is wounded? Through this
wound a man’s real manhood and immortality flow out,
and he bleeds to an everlasting death. I see this blood
flowing now. […]

I have paid no poll-tax for six years. I was put into a
jail once on this account, for one night; and, as I stood
considering the walls of solid stone, two or three feet
thick, the door of wood and iron, a foot thick, and the
iron grating which strained the light, I could not help
being struck with the foolishness of that institution
which treated me as if I were mere flesh and blood and
bones, to be locked up. I wondered that it should have
concluded at length that this was the best use it could
put me to, and had never thought to avail itself of my
services in some way. I saw that, if there was a wall of
stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still
more difficult one to climb or break through, before
they could get to be as free as I was. I did not for a
moment feel confined, and the walls seemed a great
waste of stone and mortar. I felt as if I alone of all my
townsmen had paid my tax. They plainly did not know
how to treat me, but behaved like persons who are
underbred. In every threat and in every compliment
there was a blunder; for they thought that my chief
desire was to stand the other side of that stone wall. I
could not but smile to see how industriously they
locked the door on my meditations, which followed
them out again without let or hindrance, and they were
really all that was dangerous. As they could not reach
me they had resolved to punish my body; just as boys,
if they cannot come at some person against whom they
have a spite, will abuse his dog. I saw that the State
was half-witted, that it was timid as a lone woman with
her silver spoons, and that it did not know its friends
from its foes, and I lost all my remaining respect for it,
and pitied it.

Thus the State never intentionally confronts a man’s
sense, intellectual or moral, but only his body, his
senses. It is not armed with superior wit or honesty, but with superior physical strength. I was not born to be forced. I will breathe after my own fashion. [...] If a plant cannot live according to its nature, it dies; and so a man.

The night in prison was novel and interesting enough. The prisoners in their shirt-sleeves were enjoying a chat and the evening air in the doorway, when I entered. But the jailer said, “Come, boys, it is time to lock up,” and so they dispersed, and I heard the sound of their steps returning into the hollow apartments. My roommate was introduced to me by the jailer, as “a first-rate fellow and a clever man.” When the door was locked, he showed me where to hang my hat, and how he managed matters there. The rooms were white-washed once a month; and this one, at least, was the whitest, most simply furnished, and probably the neat-est apartment in the town. He naturally wanted to know where I came from, and what brought me there; and, when I had told him, I asked him in my turn how he came there, presuming him to be an honest man, of course; and, as the world goes, I believe he was. “Why,” said he, “they accuse me of burning a barn; but I never did it.” As near as I could discover, he had probably gone to bed in a barn when drunk, and smoked his pipe there; and so a barn was burnt. He had the reputation of being a clever man, had been there some three months waiting for his trial to come on, and would have to wait as much longer; but he was quite domesticated and contented, since he got his board for nothing, and thought that he was well treated. [...]

When I came out of prison — for some one inter-fered, and paid that tax — I did not perceive that great changes had taken place on the common, such as he observed who went in a youth, and emerged a totter and gray-headed man; and yet a change had to my eyes come over the scene — the town, and State, and country — greater than any that mere time could effect. I saw yet more distinctly the State in which I lived. I saw to what extent the people among whom I lived could be trusted as good neighbors and friends; that their friendship was for summer weather only; that they did not greatly propose to do right; they were a distinct race from me by their prejudices and superstitions, as the Chinamen and Malays are; that, in their sacrifices to humanity, they ran no risks, not even to their property; that, after all, they were not so noble but they treated the thief as he had treated them, and hoped, by a certain outward observance and a few prayers, and by walking in a particular straight though useless path from time to time, to save their souls. This may be to judge my neighbors harshly; for I believe that many of them are not aware that they have such an institution as the jail in their village. [...]

I do not wish to quarrel with any man or nation. I do not wish to split hairs, to make fine distinctions, or set myself up as better than my neighbors. I seek rather, I may say, even an excuse for conforming to the laws of the land. I am but too ready to conform to them. Indeed, I have reason to suspect myself on this head; and each year, as the tax-gatherer comes round, I find myself disposed to review the acts and position of the general and State governments, and the spirit of the people, to discover a pretext for conformity. [...]

The authority of government, even such as I am willing to submit to — for I will cheerfully obey those who know and can do better than I, and in many things even those who neither know nor can do so well — is still an impure one: to be strictly just, it must have the sanction and consent of the governed. It can have no pure right over my person and property but what I concede to it. The progress from an absolute to a limited monarchy, from a limited monarchy to a democracy, is a progress toward a true respect for the individual. Even the Chinese philosopher was wise enough to regard the individual as the basis of the empire. Is a democracy, such as we know it, the last improvement possible in government? Is it not possible to take a step further towards recognizing and organizing the rights of man? There will never be a really free and enlightened State, until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly. I please myself with imagining a State at last which can afford to be just to all men, and to treat the individual with respect as a neighbor; which even would not think it inconsistent with its own repose, if a few were to live aloof from it, not meddling with it, nor embraced by it, who fulfilled all the duties of neighbors and fellow-men. A State which bore this kind of fruit, and suffered it to drop off as fast as it ripened, would prepare the way for a still more perfect and glorious State, which also I have imagined, but not yet anywhere seen.

“Essay on Civil Disobedience”
Civil Disobedience, or Resisting Civil Government as it was originally titled, was published in 1849. Thoreau was 32 years old, living in Massachusetts. At this point, Thoreau had already spent his time at Walden Pond. Thoreau had also spent a night in jail years earlier after refusing to pay a poll tax, which he discusses in Civil Disobedience.

Here are the ten best quotes from his 25-page essay. 1. I heartily accept the motto, 'That government is best which governs least:' and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe, 'That government is best which governs not at all;' and when men are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government which they will have. This is how Thoreau begins the essay.

Henry David Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience" is an essay that attempts to persuade readers to oppose unjust government policies in general and the Mexican War and the institution of slavery in particular. Publication. Thoreau first presented the essay as a lecture on January 26, 1848, at the Concord (Massachusetts) Lyceum. In May 1849, it was published under the title "Resistance to Civil Government" in Aesthetic Papers, a short-lived journal of transcendentalist Elizabeth Peabody (1804-1894). In 1866, four years after Thoreau's death, the essay was published unde