of a scoundrel than Smith, her vote simply adds to support for Jones. So, the result of this attitude toward alternative parties and candidates is that a major party has to be only slightly less bad than its rival and its base will fall in line. Regulations that weaken and disadvantage third parties only reinforce the voter’s sense that she really has only two alternatives. Indeed, the two major parties have perhaps never been less popular, at least as evidenced by the number of people who are registered with them. And yet their control over the political system is thoroughly entrenched. Granted, many voters who think of themselves as independents still pretty reliably vote for one party. But it is hard to maintain that such stark limitations on voter options are consistent with robust, active democratic citizenship.

In addition to these structural problems, there is the behavior of particular officials. The current president has a lamentable tendency to dismiss any report that he dislikes as “fake news,” which reinforces the media polarization trend mentioned above. He has also tried to favor news outlets he likes and disadvantage the ones he resents. But he is not the first president to try to control information to enhance his position; his predecessor was criticized for disallowing any independent photographers so that only images from the official (and therefore more flattering) White House photographer would become the visual historical record. More problematically, recent administrations have relied on secrecy and appeals to national security to shield citizens from discovering what they were up to, and whistleblowers and leakers have been prosecuted and punished. Other elected officials have interfered with freedom of information requests. Secrecy is surely warranted in certain cases, but at times government officials are wrongly suppressing information that citizens need in order to make well-informed democratic decisions and hold their government accountable for its actions.

It is easy to magnify current difficulties and feel that we are at a watershed moment in our nation’s history. But from the broader historical perspective, we have probably never had better conditions for good citizenship, if only for the fact that for much of our nation’s history women and non-whites were legally (and then later quasi-legally) forbidden from voting or exercising their civil rights. Citizens today also have unprecedented access to information and new technologies that enable mass mobilization and coordinated activity. Still, we should not ignore the real barriers that hinder their ability to take part in democratic self-government.
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When the ABA Section of Civil Rights and Social Justice invited me to write about the U.S. Constitution as a Human Rights Hero, I must admit that I was ambivalent. On the one hand, we have become increasingly aware lately of some of our Constitution’s deep flaws:

- Article II’s Electoral College provision prioritizes states’ rights over democratic equality, empowering a president who lost the popular vote to disregard the views of the majority of Americans about what is unacceptable treatment of immigrants, minorities, and the disadvantaged.
- Article I invites the states to put innumerable thumbs on the scales of federal as well as state elections—which many states have in the form of racist felon disenfranchisement statutes, cynical voter ID requirements, voter purges, and manipulation of registration and voting procedures. Once voted into office, a party can lock in its position.

But then, I thought, even the greatest heroes have their imperfections. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, our revered founders, were slave owners.

And our Constitution is indeed heroically admirable in many respects. It establishes structures that are conducive and probably necessary to human rights flourishing. The Preamble repudiates authoritarian power grabs by positing that “we the people” decide what will secure the blessings of liberty—not our elected leaders. Article VI confirms that the People’s Constitution is the supreme law of the land—not the will of elected leaders. To prevent the accumulation of too much power in any one branch, the Constitution creates an elaborate system of checks and balances among the three branches of the federal government, including an independent judiciary, and between the federal and state governments.

Donald Trump has been learning through experience that the Constitution sometimes prevents the president from having his way. Federal judges have checked unconstitutional executive policies and actions like the discriminatory travel ban, dehumanization of transgender military personnel, and defiance of the right of a 17-year-old girl in Texas to choose to have an
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