

American Constitutional Law and History

*Carolina Academic Press
Law Advisory Board*



Gary J. Simson, Chairman
Dean, Mercer University School of Law

Raj Bhala
University of Kansas School of Law

Davison M. Douglas
Dean, William and Mary Law School

Paul Finkelman
Albany Law School

Robert M. Jarvis
*Shepard Broad Law Center
Nova Southeastern University*

Vincent R. Johnson
St. Mary's University School of Law

Peter Nicolas
University of Washington School of Law

Michael A. Olivas
University of Houston Law Center

Kenneth L. Port
William Mitchell College of Law

H. Jefferson Powell
The George Washington University Law School

Michael P. Scharf
Case Western Reserve University School of Law

Peter M. Shane
*Michael E. Moritz College of Law
The Ohio State University*

American Constitutional Law and History

Michael S. Ariens

PROFESSOR OF LAW, ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2012
Michael S. Ariens
All Rights Reserved

ISBN: 978-1-61163-098-5
LCCN: 2012934921

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668

www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America.

For my students

Contents

Preface	xv
Articles of Confederation	xvii
The Constitution of the United States	xxiii
Timeline of Events in American Legal and Political History	xxxvii
Biographies of Selected Justices of the Supreme Court	li
Chapter One • The Constitution and Judicial Power	3
A. Background to the Creation of the Constitution	3
B. Judicial Review	6
1. Review of Federal Action	6
A Timeline of Events Leading to <i>Marbury v. Madison</i>	7
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i>	9
2. Judicial Review of State Actions	18
<i>Martin v. Hunter's Lessee</i>	18
C. Modes of Constitutional Interpretation	20
1. Historical Background	20
<i>Cohens v. Virginia</i>	20
<i>Calder v. Bull</i>	20
2. Sources of Constitutional Interpretation	23
a. Text	23
b. History	25
c. Structure	25
d. Precedent	26
e. Consensus	26
f. Purposes	27
3. The Modern Court and Constitutional Interpretation	27
<i>District of Columbia v. Heller</i>	28
D. The Limits of the Judicial Power	51
1. Justiciability	51
a. Standing	53
<i>Valley Forge Christian College v. Americans United</i>	
<i>for Separation of Church and State</i>	53
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i>	56
<i>Allen v. Wright</i>	56
b. Political Question Doctrine	65
<i>Baker v. Carr</i>	66
<i>Powell v. McCormack</i>	72
2. Congressional Limitations on Federal Judicial Power	73
A Timeline of Events Leading to <i>Ex Parte McCordle</i>	74
<i>Ex Parte McCordle</i>	75

E. The Work of the Supreme Court	76
Chapter Two • Federal Legislative Power	79
A. The Meaning of Enumerated Powers	79
1. The Necessary And Proper Clause	80
<i>McCulloch v. Maryland</i>	81
<i>United States v. Comstock</i>	91
B. Commerce Power	102
1. Historical Background	102
<i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i>	102
2. Early Judicial Interpretation of Commerce: Rise and Fall	102
a. Regulating Commerce	103
<i>United States v. E.C. Knight Co.</i>	103
<i>Swift & Co. v. United States</i>	108
<i>Houston, East & West Texas Railway Co. v. United States</i> (<i>The Shreveport Rate Cases</i>)	109
b. Prohibiting Interstate Commerce	110
<i>Champion v. Ames (The Lottery Case)</i>	110
<i>Hammer v. Dagenhart</i>	113
c. Raising The Stakes	117
<i>Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States (Sick Chicken Case)</i>	119
<i>Carter v. Carter Coal Co.</i>	122
d. Doctrinal Retreat And Abandonment	123
A Partial Timeline of the Court Reorganization (Court-Packing) Plan	124
<i>NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.</i>	125
<i>United States v. Darby</i>	129
<i>Wickard v. Filburn</i>	131
e. Civil Rights and the Commerce Clause	134
<i>Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States</i>	135
<i>Katzenbach v. McClung</i>	135
f. The Re-Emergence and Retreat of Commerce	
Clause Limitations	135
<i>United States v. Lopez</i>	136
<i>Perez v. United States</i>	150
<i>United States v. Morrison</i>	151
<i>Gonzales v. Raich</i>	152
C. Immunity from Federal Regulation	169
<i>Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority</i>	170
<i>Printz v. United States</i>	178
D. Other Congressional Powers	187
1. Taxation and Spending	187
<i>Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Co. (Child Labor Tax Case)</i>	188
<i>United States v. Butler</i>	188
<i>Chas. C. Steward Mach. Co. v. Davis</i>	192
<i>Helvering v. Davis</i>	195
<i>South Dakota v. Dole</i>	196
2. Treaty and War Powers	199
<i>Missouri v. Holland</i>	199
<i>Medellin v. Texas</i>	200
3. Power under the Reconstruction Amendments	200

Chapter 3 • Separation of Powers	201
A. Introduction	201
B. Presidential Power	202
A Partial Timeline of Events Leading to the <i>Steel Seizure Case</i>	202
<i>Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer (Steel Seizure Case)</i>	203
A Partial Timeline of Events Leading to <i>Dames & Moore v. Regan</i>	216
<i>Dames & Moore v. Regan</i>	217
<i>Medellin v. Texas</i>	222
C. Presidential Immunities	223
A Partial Timeline of Watergate and <i>United States v. Nixon</i>	223
<i>United States v. Nixon</i>	225
<i>Clinton v. Jones</i>	229
A Partial Timeline of Events Involving Impeachment of President Clinton	234
D. Congress's Power	235
1. The Administrative State	235
2. Non-Delegation Doctrine	236
3. Legislative Veto	236
<i>Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Chadha</i>	236
<i>Morrison v. Olson</i>	245
E. Separation of Powers and Foreign Policy	246
1. General Principles	246
<i>United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.</i>	246
2. War Powers Resolution	248
3. War, Terrorism, and Separation of Powers	249
<i>Hamdi v. Rumsfeld</i>	249
<i>Hamdan v. Rumsfeld</i>	266
<i>Boumediene v. Bush</i>	266
<i>Munaf v. Green</i>	267
Chapter 4 • National Markets, State Regulations, and Judicial Review	269
A. Introduction	269
B. Dormant Commerce Clause	271
1. Historical Background	271
<i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i>	271
<i>Willson v. Black Bird Creek Marsh Co.</i>	272
<i>Cooley v. Board of Wardens</i>	272
2. Dormant Commerce Clause Theory and Test	273
a. Theory	273
b. Doctrine	275
3. Modern Doctrinal Development	276
a. Protectionism and Discrimination	276
<i>City of Philadelphia v. New Jersey</i>	276
<i>C&A Carbone, Inc. v. Clarkstown</i>	282
<i>United Haulers Ass'n, Inc. v. Oneida-Herkimer</i> <i>Solid Waste Mgmt. Auth.</i>	282
b. Facially Neutral Statutes That May Discriminate	283
<i>Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advertising Comm'n</i>	283
<i>Exxon Corp. v. Maryland</i>	288
c. Facially Neutral Laws That Are Non-Discriminatory	289
<i>South Carolina State Highway Department v. Barnwell Bros.</i>	289

<i>Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona</i>	292
<i>Kassel v. Consolidated Freightways Corp.</i>	296
d. The Market Participant Exception to the Dormant Commerce Clause	304
<i>White v. Massachusetts Council of Constr. Employees</i>	305
<i>South-Central Timber Development, Inc. v. Wunnicke</i>	305
C. Privileges and Immunities Clause of Article IV, § 2	309
1. Citizens	309
2. Privileges and Immunities	310
<i>Toomer v. Witsell</i>	310
3. “Of the Several States”	310
4. Doctrine	310
<i>United Building and Construction Trades Council v. Camden</i>	310
5. Standard of Appellate Review	316
Chapter 5 • Individual Rights, Incorporation, and the State Action Doctrine	319
A. Introduction	319
B. Incorporation	320
1. Before the Civil War	320
<i>Barron v. Baltimore</i>	321
<i>Permoli v. New Orleans</i>	322
2. The Privileges or Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment	323
<i>The Slaughter-House Cases</i>	323
3. Successful Incorporation	334
<i>Twining v. New Jersey</i>	334
<i>Palko v. Connecticut</i>	336
<i>Adamson v. California</i>	337
<i>McDonald v. Chicago</i>	342
C. The State Action Doctrine	342
1. Historical Antecedents	342
<i>The Civil Rights Cases</i>	342
D. Modern Definitions of “State” Action	347
1. The Public Function Doctrine	347
<i>Marsh v. Alabama</i>	348
<i>Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.</i>	349
2. Entanglement Doctrine	353
<i>Shelley v. Kraemer</i>	353
<i>Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority</i>	356
3. State Action and Discriminatory Peremptory Challenges	359
Chapter 6 • Due Process	361
A. Introduction	361
B. Procedural Due Process	361
1. Deprivation of Life, Liberty or Property	362
C. Substantive Due Process	363
1. Introduction	363
2. Historical Antecedents	365
<i>Dred Scott v. Sandford</i>	366
<i>Munn v. Illinois</i>	366
3. The Lochner Era	367
<i>Allgeyer v. Louisiana</i>	367
<i>Lochner v. New York</i>	371

A Partial Timeline of the Supreme Court and Substantive Due Process, 1890–1937	378
<i>Nebbia v. New York</i>	381
<i>Morehead v. New York ex rel. Tipaldo</i>	383
A Partial Timeline of the Court Reorganization (Court-Packing) Plan	384
4. The Switch in Time?	385
<i>West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish</i>	385
5. The Re-Emergence of Substantive Due Process	390
<i>Skinner v. Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson</i>	391
<i>Williamson v. Lee Optical</i>	393
<i>Griswold v. Connecticut</i>	396
<i>Eisenstadt v. Baird</i>	406
<i>Roe v. Wade</i>	407
a. Due Process Liberty and Abortion	415
A Partial Timeline of the Supreme Court’s Abortion Cases, 1973–1991	416
<i>Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey</i>	417
<i>Gonzales v. Carhart</i>	439
b. Sexual Autonomy and the Right to Privacy	439
<i>Bowers v. Hardwick</i>	439
<i>Romer v. Evans</i>	442
<i>Lawrence v. Texas</i>	443
c. Marriage and the Right to Privacy	452
<i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	452
<i>Zablocki v. Redhail</i>	454
d. Family and the Right to Privacy	455
<i>Moore v. City of East Cleveland</i>	456
<i>Michael H. v. Gerald D.</i>	459
<i>Troxel v. Granville</i>	467
e. The Right to Die	473
<i>Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health</i>	473
<i>Washington v. Glucksberg</i>	484
<i>Vacco v. Quill</i>	496
6. Due Process and Equal Protection	499
<i>San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez</i>	500
<i>Plyler v. Doe</i>	513
D. Takings Clause	514
1. Is The Property “Taken”?	514
<i>Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon</i>	515
2. Is It Taken for a Public Use?	519
<i>Kelo v. City of New London</i>	520
3. Is the Compensation Just?	527
E. Contracts Clause	528
<i>Home Building & Loan Ass’n v. Blaisdell</i>	528
Chapter 7 • Equal Protection	535
A. Introduction	535
1. Ends and Means	536
2. Equal Protection Analysis	539
B. Rational Basis Review	540

1. The Standard Approach	540
<i>Railway Express Agency, Inc. v. New York</i>	540
<i>Williamson v. Lee Optical</i>	543
<i>New York City Transit Authority v. Beazer</i>	544
2. Rational Basis with a Bite	546
<i>Romer v. Evans</i>	546
<i>City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center</i>	555
C. Race-Based Classifications	557
1. Historical Background	557
<i>Dred Scott v. Sandford</i>	557
<i>Plessy v. Ferguson</i>	559
A Partial Timeline of the History of Civil Rights, 1865–1968	564
2. Strict Scrutiny in Racial Classification Cases	567
<i>Korematsu v. United States</i>	567
3. The End of Jim Crow	572
<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>	573
<i>Brown v. Board of Education (Brown II)</i>	575
4. De-Segregating Public Schools	576
5. Proving Discrimination When the Law Is Facially Neutral	577
<i>Washington v. Davis</i>	577
<i>McClesky v. Kemp</i>	581
6. How to Prove Discriminatory Purpose	582
<i>Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing</i> <i>Development Corp.</i>	583
D. Affirmative Action	585
<i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i>	589
<i>Gratz v. Bollinger</i>	613
<i>Parents Involved in Community Schools v.</i> <i>Seattle School District No. 1</i>	614
E. Gender Discrimination	615
<i>Craig v. Boren</i>	616
<i>Personnel Administrator of Massachusetts v. Feeney</i>	623
<i>Kirchberg v. Feenstra</i>	623
<i>Michael M. v. Superior Court</i>	623
<i>Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan</i>	628
<i>United States v. Virginia</i>	632
F. Other Forms of Discrimination and Heightened Scrutiny	641
1. Alienage	641
<i>Cabell v. Chavez-Salido</i>	642
2. Children of Unmarried Parents	650
Chapter 8 • Freedom of Speech, Association, and Press	653
A. Introduction	653
1. Historical Background	653
2. Why Freedom of Speech?	654
3. Is the State Regulating the Content of the Speech?	654
<i>Boos v. Barry</i>	655
4. Where May Speakers Speak?	656
5. Vagueness and Overbreadth	657
a. Vagueness	657
b. Overbreadth	657

<i>United States v. Stevens</i>	658
B. Content-Based Regulations of Speech	658
1. Inciting Illegal Activity	660
A Partial Timeline of World War I, the First Red Scare, and the Supreme Court's Initial Free Speech Decisions	660
<i>Schenck v. United States</i>	661
<i>Frohwerk v. United States</i>	662
<i>Debs v. United States</i>	664
<i>Abrams v. United States</i>	665
A Partial Timeline of the Second Red Scare and the Cold War	670
<i>Dennis v. United States</i>	671
<i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i>	680
2. Fighting Words	682
<i>Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire</i>	682
a. Group Libel	685
<i>Beauharnais v. Illinois</i>	685
b. Hate Speech	689
<i>R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul</i>	690
<i>Virginia v. Black</i>	690
3. Defamation	698
<i>New York Times Co. v. Sullivan</i>	698
4. Obscenity and Pornography	709
a. Defining Obscene Speech	709
<i>Roth v. United States</i>	709
<i>Miller v. California</i>	712
<i>Paris Adult Theatre I v. Slaton</i>	716
b. Child Pornography	721
<i>New York v. Ferber</i>	721
c. Secondary Effects of Sexually Oriented Speech	724
<i>Young v. American Mini-Theatres, Inc.</i>	724
<i>City of Los Angeles v. Alameda Books, Inc.</i>	725
5. Offensive Speech	733
<i>Cohen v. California</i>	733
<i>Federal Communications Commission v. Pacifica Foundation</i>	737
6. Commercial Speech	744
<i>Virginia State Board of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, Inc.</i>	745
<i>Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission</i>	753
<i>44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island</i>	759
7. Conduct That Communicates	767
a. The Test of Symbolic Speech	767
<i>United States v. O'Brien</i>	767
b. Free Speech and the American Flag	770
<i>Texas v. Johnson</i>	770
8. Religious Speech	780
<i>Widmar v. Vincent</i>	780
<i>Rosenberger v. Rectors and Visitors of the University of Virginia</i>	781
C. Prior Restraints	781
A Partial Timeline of <i>The Pentagon Papers Case</i>	782

	<i>New York Times Co. v. United States (The Pentagon Papers Case)</i>	783
	<i>Nebraska Press Ass'n v. Stuart</i>	792
D.	Electoral Politics, Money, and Speech	792
	1. Campaign Announcements, Promises, and Pledges	793
	<i>Republican Party of Minnesota v. White</i>	793
	<i>Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., Inc.</i>	804
	2. Money, Politics, and Speech	805
	<i>Citizens United v. FEC</i>	806
E.	Freedom of Association	806
	1. Requiring Disclosure of Membership	808
	<i>National Association for the Advancement of Colored People</i>	
	<i>v. Alabama ex rel. Patterson</i>	808
	2. Laws Prohibiting Discrimination by Private Associations	811
	<i>Roberts v. United States Jaycees</i>	811
	3. Compelled Association	816
	<i>Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System</i>	
	<i>v. Southworth</i>	817
	<i>Christian Legal Society Chapter of the University</i>	
	<i>of California Hastings College of Law v. Martinez</i>	821
F.	Freedom of Press	821
	<i>Branzburg v. Hayes</i>	821
Chapter 9 • The Religion Clause		829
A.	Introduction	829
	1. Historical Background	829
	A Partial Timeline of the Debate on the Religion Clause	831
	2. Theory of the Religion Clause	832
	a. Neutrality	833
	b. Separation	834
	c. Accommodation	834
	d. Voluntarism	835
	e. Federalism	835
	3. Categorization of Claims	836
	<i>Locke v. Davey</i>	837
B.	The Nonestablishment Clause	843
	<i>Everson v. Board of Education</i>	843
	<i>Zorach v. Clauson</i>	854
	<i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i>	858
	<i>County of Allegheny v. ACLU</i>	867
	<i>Van Orden v. Perry</i>	869
	<i>McCreary County v. American Civil Liberties Union</i>	881
C.	The Free Exercise Clause	883
	<i>Sherbert v. Verner</i>	884
	<i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i>	889
	<i>Employment Division v. Smith</i>	895
D.	Defining Religion	906
	<i>United States v. Seeger</i>	908
	<i>Welsh v. United States</i>	908
	Bibliography	911

Preface

In addition to teaching doctrine, this book has a threefold purpose: (1) it explains through repeated examples how a judge tries to persuade the reader that his or her opinion (whether majority, concurring, or dissenting) more accurately reflects the meaning of the Constitution than a competing opinion; (2) it assesses the manner in which American history has informed and affected the development of American constitutional law; and (3) it highlights and evaluates the impact of legal thought, particularly legal formalism and legal realism, on Supreme Court decision making. As a result, the excerpted cases are edited for their doctrinal point and for two other reasons: (a) to demonstrate how the excerpted opinions attempt to persuade the reader that the particular vision expressed in the opinion is more true to the text of the Constitution, its history and structure, earlier Supreme Court precedent, elite and popular consensus and the purposes of the Constitution than a contrasting opinion, and (b) how realism and formalism, as well as the presumed “legacy” of those two jurisprudential approaches, affect the ways in which the justices decide cases.

When Supreme Court justices write their opinions, they regularly use recurring types of reasoning. The Justices attempt to persuade the reader by using (1) reasoning by analogy; (2) syllogistic reasoning; (3) narrower or broader level of generality arguments; and (4) arguments of “rhetoric,” including (a) the appeal to authority, also known as the “famous dead person” argument, (b) the argument of subsequent consequences, also known as the claim of speculation or the “slippery slope” argument, (c) the appeal to passion, and (d) “flipping” the adversary’s argument, that is, turning one party’s argument in such a way as to favor the other party’s position. Some forms of reasoning predominate in different areas of constitutional law (e.g., members of the Supreme Court regularly use competing and varying levels of generality in substantive due process cases, and use reasoning by analogy in free speech cases, and make “rhetorical” arguments in federalism cases). These same forms of reasoning are given again and again in opinions. This book is structured to make students proficient at naming, applying, and critiquing each of these types of reasoning.

This book also offers a “long view” of constitutional law. Given the contested and often unstable nature of constitutional law doctrine, it is crucial for students to understand not only *what* the Court concluded, but *how* the Court as a historical matter reached this point. For example, it is important for students to understand that the 1787 Constitution was written in significant part in reaction to the Articles of Confederation. Thus, I include the Articles to let students compare it with the Constitution. Another example is the Court’s free speech decision in *Dennis v. United States* (1951), excerpted in Chapter 8.B.1. The opinions in *Dennis* are enigmatic without understanding the *Dennis* Court’s (1) reaction to its post-World War I free speech jurisprudence, (2) the rise of Nazi Germany and World War II, (3) the onset of the Cold War, the Korean Conflict and the testing by the

Soviet Union of a nuclear bomb, and (4) the cultural and legal impact of the trials of the Rosenbergs for conspiracy to commit espionage and of Alger Hiss for perjury. The Court's subsequent free speech cases are best understood in light of the reaction to its decision in *Dennis*. To give students a sketch of American history, the book provides a modest *Timeline of Events in American Legal and Political History*. In order to provide a more particular historical focus, a number of specific *Timelines* are included before opinions to provide a context for understanding those cases.

Some constitutional law doctrine is rule-based, while other doctrine is standards-based. Crafting rules echoes historical legal formalism, while adopting standards echoes historical legal realism. All judges are aware of the history and impact of both legal formalism and legal realism in American legal thought. No judge will claim to be solely a formalist or a realist, though most judges prefer one jurisprudential approach to the other, and neither legal formalism nor legal realism should be understood as reflective of a judge's political conservatism or liberalism. Judges now largely use formalism and realism as techniques to craft doctrine. The means that most judges will adopt rules (a more formalistic approach) in some areas of constitutional law and standards (a more realistic approach) in other doctrinal areas. To understand how and why judges oscillate between rules and standards, a student needs to understand the history of legal formalism and legal realism.

This book is not intended to serve as a compendium, but as a survey of the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court. Instead of citing secondary authorities in the text, students may look at a *Bibliography* with citations to important secondary works in constitutional law. In addition, students are given an "Afterword" rather than "Notes and Comments." The *Afterword* provides both an assessment of the excerpted case and a summary of any significant changes generated by the excerpted case. The *Afterword* reinforces the need for students to understand how the different premises of the majority and dissenting opinions bring forth different analytical approaches.

Unlike other areas of American law, it is important to understand not only what the Court decided, but who wrote the opinion of the Court (as well as who wrote any dissenting opinion). Thus, students should consult the brief biographies of important Supreme Court justices.

Finally, AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND HISTORY includes a number of decision trees and tables intended to give the student a better visual sense of constitutional law doctrine. For example, students can look at the rather complicated decision tree that attempts to encapsulate free speech jurisprudence. That general free speech decision tree is then broken down into component parts as the student moves through the various free speech issues decided by the Court.

Thanks to my wife Renée for reading much of the book and spotting a number of infelicities and errors. Thanks also to my research assistants, Aaron Culp, Buddy Parsons, Gregory Roberts, and Lauren Valkenaar, for reading and re-reading the manuscript. Thanks to Maria Vega for getting the book in printable shape. Finally, thanks to my Constitutional Law students, whose thoughts and ideas helped shape the structure and content of the book. All remaining errors are my responsibility. If you have thoughts about how to improve the book, please e-mail me at: mariens@stmarytx.edu.

Michael Ariens
January 2012