

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW
Cases, History, and Practice
Fourth Edition

LexisNexis Law School Publishing Advisory Board

William Araiza

Professor of Law
Brooklyn Law School

Lenni B. Benson

Professor of Law & Associate Dean for Professional Development
New York Law School

Raj Bhala

Rice Distinguished Professor
University of Kansas, School of Law

Ruth Colker

Distinguished University Professor & Heck-Faust Memorial Chair in Constitutional Law
Ohio State University, Moritz College of Law

David Gamage

Assistant Professor of Law
UC Berkeley School of Law

Joan Heminway

College of Law Distinguished Professor of Law
University of Tennessee College of Law

Edward Imwinkelried

Edward L. Barrett, Jr. Professor of Law
UC Davis School of Law

David I. C. Thomson

LP Professor & Director, Lawyering Process Program
University of Denver, Sturm College of Law

Melissa Weresh

Director of Legal Writing and Professor of Law
Drake University Law School

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Cases, History, and Practice

Fourth Edition

WILLIAM D. ARAIZA

Professor of Law
Brooklyn Law School

M. ISABEL MEDINA

Ferris Family Distinguished Professor of Law
Loyola University New Orleans College of Law

ISBN:978-1-4224-8536-1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Araiza, William D.
Constitutional law : cases, history, and practice / William D. Araiza, M. Isabel Medina. -- 4th ed.
p. cm.
Previous ed. has sub-title: Cases, history, and dialogues
Includes index.
ISBN 978-1-4224-8536-1 (hard cover)
1. Constitutional law--United States--Cases. I. Medina, M. Isabel. II. Title.
KF4550.A758 2011
342.73--dc22
2011000103

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks and Michie is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender and the Matthew Bender Flame Design are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2011 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.
All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material exceeding fair use, 17 U.S.C. § 107, may be licensed for a fee of 25¢ per page per copy from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

NOTE TO USERS

To ensure that you are using the latest materials available in this area, please be sure to periodically check the LexisNexis Law School web site for downloadable updates and supplements at www.lexisnexis.com/lawschool.

Editorial Offices
121 Chanlon Rd., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

PREFACE

This edition of the book marks the departure of the Professors Phoebe Haddon and Dorothy Roberts, the last of the original group of authors that came together to write the First Edition. It retains the core of the original authors' work, and, just as importantly, continues to reflect their goal of creating a challenging, sophisticated work that is nevertheless approachable to students and appropriate for their role as future practitioners of constitutional law.

In attempting to come closer to that elusive goal, the Fourth Edition features several significant changes. First, it provides, at appropriate points, concise statements of the frameworks of analysis developed by the Court to resolve constitutional claims. This provision of "the rules" is intended to complement students' learning, by providing a focal point for their reading and discussion of the cases. Obviously, constitutional law is too rich and complex to be reduced to a series of terse rules. Providing these analytical frameworks is designed to provide a jumping-off point for students to consider the more difficult issues that lurk behind those rules.

Second, the Fourth Edition has attempted to highlight areas of the law that are often under-studied in a basic constitutional law class. For example, throughout, the book gives significant attention to immigration, naturalization and citizenship issues. These issues are becoming more important in a society that is globalizing at a rapid rate but at the same time feeling significant insecurity as a result of that process, because of both the emphasis on terrorism and the changes that immigrant populations are perceived to augur for American life.

Third, the Fourth Edition aims to prepare students for practice. This is clear from the very start of the book. The Introduction provides an extended discussion of constitutional litigation, by following a modern Supreme Court case, *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, from inception to the Court's opinion. In addition, the pleadings, hearing transcripts, opinions and other materials considered in the Introduction are available on the Internet at <http://www.loyno.edu/~hamdi>. Professors and students may find access to these materials helpful in better understanding the case, and the role of attorneys and courts in constitutional litigation. Understanding how constitutional litigation actually happens helps students realize that the process of making constitutional "law" is more than the process by which the Supreme Court writes an opinion stating broad principles. The process happens every day, in small decisions made in courthouses, city halls and police stations across the nation. The Introduction illustrates this dynamic.

In the Introduction students are asked to read the entire *Hamdi* opinion. Casebooks usually present only heavily-edited opinions that focus on one or a small number of issues. Our hope in providing the full opinion in *Hamdi* is to give students a sense of the variety of issues an opinion often has to resolve. Finally, throughout the book students are asked to think of the issues in the context of what they would have to allege or assert in a complaint, a brief or in developing an argument, consistently urging them to think of the practical applications or implications of theory.

Writing a casebook — even writing a new edition of an existing casebook — is a task that cannot be completed by authors alone. Colleagues, students, administrative assistants and others all play crucial roles. Professor Araiza wishes to thank Rebecca Gold, Helen

PREFACE

Gutgarts, Kristine Holm, Sheila Jerry, Alison Matela, Edward Murray, Rob Sobelman and Jay Zeffren for their research assistance, Gloria Kern for her secretarial help, and the staff and faculty of the Brooklyn Law School Library. Professor Medina wishes to thank her colleagues Brian Bromberger, Joel Friedman, Johanna Kalb, Stephen Higginson, Kathryn Lorio, Lawrence Moore and Karen Sokol for their advice and support, Raechelle Munna and Mary-Patricia E. Livengood Wray for research assistance, Dawn Harvey for invaluable secretarial assistance, Peter McArdle for assistance with technology issues, and the staff and faculty of the Monroe Library and the Loyola University New Orleans College of Law Library. Thanks are also due to Keith Moore, our always-helpful and patient editor at LexisNexis, and to the entire LexisNexis team. Professor Araiza also wishes to thank his partner, Stephen Schneider, for his patience, support and understanding. Professor Medina gives a special thanks to her children, Genevieve, Nicholas and Alexander. Both authors wish to thank the students in their constitutional law classes for helping them to think carefully about law, theory and pedagogy.

Finally, both authors owe a special debt of thanks to the original authors of the casebook: Phoebe Haddon, Donald Lively, Dorothy Roberts and Russell Weaver. Even though they have all ostensibly left the book, their wisdom and judgment remains evident on every page.

The authors welcome comments, input and suggestions.

W.D.A.

M.I.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
A. THE MAKING OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW	1
1. The Role of the Three Branches of Government in the Development of Constitutional Norms — Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary	1
2. Article III — The Role of the Courts	3
B. THE MAKING OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW THROUGH A SUPREME COURT CASE	4
1. <i>Hamdi v. Rumsfeld</i> 's origins	5
2. Three Petitions for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	5
3. Petition for Certiorari	8
4. Grant of Certiorari	9
5. Briefs of the Parties	10
6. Amicus Curiae Briefs	11
7. Oral Argument	11
8. Deliberations and Drafting the Opinions	13
C. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECISION	14
<i>Hamdi v. Rumsfeld</i>	14
1. Understanding the opinion announcing the judgment of the Court — Self-Test:	32
2. Understanding Justice Souter's opinion, joined by Justice Ginsburg — Self-Test:	41
3. Understanding Justice Scalia's dissent, joined by Justice Stevens — Self-Test:	56
4. Understanding Justice Thomas's dissent — Self-test:	68
5. Supreme Court Opinions: majority, plurality, concurrence, and dissent .	68
6. Self-Test	69
D. IMPLEMENTING <i>HAMDI</i>	69
E. CITIZENSHIP	70
F. THE PROBLEM OF JUDICIAL REVIEW — CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION	71
<i>Calder v. Bull</i>	72
Note: The Debate in the Modern Context	73
<i>McDonald v. Chicago</i>	74
Note: Use of Foreign Law in Supreme Court Opinions	81
Chapter I THE JUDICIAL POWER	83
A. THE POWER "TO SAY WHAT THE LAW IS"	83
Note: The Scope of "the Judicial Power" and the Lead-Up to <i>Marbury</i> .	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Marbury v. Madison</i>	85
	Note: Introduction to <i>Martin v. Hunter's Lessee</i>	95
	<i>Martin v. Hunter's Lessee</i>	95
	Note: Supreme Court Review of State Constitutional Law Decisions . . .	97
	Note: Challenges to Judicial Review	99
	<i>Cooper v. Aaron</i>	100
	Note: Post- <i>Cooper</i> Challenges to the Supreme Court's Interpretive Supremacy	101
B.	CONGRESSIONAL CHECKS ON THE JUDICIAL POWER	102
	Note: The Background to <i>Ex parte McCordle</i> , <i>Ex parte Yerger</i> and <i>United States v. Klein</i>	103
	<i>Ex Parte McCordle</i>	103
	Note: <i>Ex parte Yerger</i> and <i>United States v. Klein</i>	105
	Note: Congressional Power Over Statutory Law	107
	Note: Jurisdiction-Stripping Statutes in the Modern Era	109
	<i>Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Schor</i>	112
C.	SELF-IMPOSED LIMITS ON THE JUDICIAL POWER	119
1.	The Political Question Doctrine	120
	<i>Baker v. Carr</i>	120
	Note: Textual Commitments of Decisions to Other Branches	128
	<i>Nixon v. United States</i>	129
	Note: Partisan Gerrymandering and the Political Question Doctrine	136
	Note: <i>Chevron v. NRDC</i> and the Interpretation of Statutory Law . . .	138
2.	The Case or Controversy Requirement	139
a.	Advisory Opinions	139
	<i>Muskrat v. United States</i>	139
b.	Standing	142
i.	The Basic Requirements	142
	<i>Warth v. Seldin</i>	143
	Note: Applying the Injury, Causation and Redressability Requirements	155
	<i>Singleton v. Wulff</i>	159
ii.	The Congressional Role in Standing	162
	<i>Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman</i>	163
	Note: "Zone of Interest" Standing	168
iii.	Modern Applications	169
	<i>Lujan v. Defenders Of Wildlife</i>	169
	Note: Generalized Grievances and Particularized Interests	180
	<i>Friends Of The Earth v. Laidlaw Environmental Services</i>	182
	Note: Standing and Large-Scale Regulatory Issues	194

TABLE OF CONTENTS

c.	Ripeness	196
	<i>United Public Workers v. Mitchell</i>	197
	Note: <i>Poe v. Ullman</i>	200
	<i>Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner</i>	202
	<i>Ohio Forestry Association v. Sierra Club</i>	204
d.	Mootness	208
	<i>DeFunis v. Odegaard</i>	209
	Note: Abortion Rights Claims and Mootness	213
	<i>Friends Of The Earth v. Laidlaw Environmental Services</i>	214
Chapter II		FEDERAL REGULATORY POWER 219
A.	INTRODUCTION: FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATORY POWER TODAY	219
B.	THE “NECESSARY AND PROPER” CLAUSE	220
	<i>McCulloch v. Maryland</i>	220
	<i>United States v. Comstock</i>	230
C.	FEDERAL POWER TO REGULATE THE ECONOMY	244
1.	Seminal Principles and Early Doctrinal Development	245
	<i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i>	245
	Note: <i>State Laws and the Development of Commerce Clause Doctrine in the Nineteenth Century</i>	250
2.	Increased Federal Regulation — And Judicial Resistance	252
	<i>United States v. E.C. Knight Co.</i>	252
	<i>Swift & Co. v. United States</i>	258
	Note: Commerce Clause Analysis Up to 1937	259
3.	The Evolution of Expanded Federal Power	262
	<i>NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.</i>	262
	Note: The Aftermath of <i>Jones & Laughlin</i>	267
	<i>United States v. Darby</i>	268
	<i>Wickard v. Filburn</i>	273
	Note: The Commerce Clause at Its Height	278
4.	A More Limited Commerce Power (?)	281
	<i>United States v. Lopez</i>	281
	Note: The Congressional Response to <i>Lopez</i>	299
	Note: <i>United States v. Morrison</i> and the Role of Congressional Fact-Finding	299
	<i>Gonzales v. Raich</i>	300
5.	Statutory Interpretation as Means of Policing the Interstate Commerce Power	315
	<i>Jones v. United States</i>	315

TABLE OF CONTENTS

D.	THE COMMERCE CLAUSE AS A LIMITATION ON STATE REGULATORY POWER	318
1.	Early Analysis and the Evolution of the Modern Rule	319
	Note: The Court’s Early Analysis	319
2.	The Evolution of the Modern Rule	321
a.	Heightened Scrutiny for Discriminatory Laws	321
	<i>Baldwin v. G.A.F. Seelig, Inc.</i>	321
	<i>Dean Milk Co. v. Madison</i>	323
b.	Balancing Local Benefits and Interstate Burdens	326
	<i>South Carolina State Highway Department v. Barnwell Bros.</i>	327
	<i>Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona</i>	329
	Note: Interstate Traffic and the Evolution of the Dormant Commerce Clause	334
3.	Modern Applications	335
a.	Modern Benefit-Burden Balancing	336
	<i>Minnesota v. Clover Leaf Creamery Co.</i>	336
b.	Discrimination Against Interstate Commerce	339
	<i>C.A. Carbone, Inc. v. City Of Clarkstown, N.Y.</i>	339
	Note: More on Discrimination and Strict Scrutiny	354
c.	Identifying Discrimination	356
	<i>Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advertising Comm’n</i>	356
	<i>Exxon Corporation v. Governor Of Maryland</i>	361
	Note: The State as a Market Participant and Provider of Government Services	368
4.	The Limits of the Doctrine — and Critiques	370
	Note: The Limits of Political Process Theory	370
	Note: Critiques of Benefit-Burden “Balancing” and the Dormant Commerce Clause Generally	371
E.	INTERSTATE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES	376
	<i>Supreme Court Of New Hampshire v. Piper</i>	376
F.	FEDERAL PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW	386
	Note: Introduction to Pre-Emption Doctrine	386
	<i>Gade v. National Solid Wastes Management Association</i>	387
	<i>Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.</i>	398
	Note: The Continued Battle Over the Presumption Against Pre-Emption	411
G.	FEDERAL REGULATION OF THE STATES	412
1.	Regulation of the States as Economic Actors	413
	Note: From <i>Wirtz</i> to <i>Garcia</i>	413
2.	The Prohibition on “Commandeering”	416
	<i>New York v. United States</i>	418
	Note: The Scope — and Limits — of the “Anti-Commandeering”	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Doctrine	436
3.	Constitutional Limits on Judicial Remedies Against States	438
a.	The <i>Young</i> Doctrine	440
	<i>Edelman v. Jordan</i>	440
	<i>Pennhurst State School & Hospital v. Halderman</i>	446
	Note: <i>Seminole Tribe</i> 's Further Limitation on <i>Young</i> Relief	456
	<i>Idaho v. Coeur D'Alene Tribe Of Idaho</i>	458
b.	State "Waiver" of Sovereign Immunity	470
	<i>Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer</i>	471
	Note: <i>Pennsylvania v. Union Gas</i> and Congress's Article I Authority to Abrogate State Sovereign Immunity	473
	<i>Seminole Tribe Of Florida v. Florida</i>	474
	Note: Article I Power to Abrogate State Sovereign Immunity After <i>Seminole Tribe</i>	485
c.	The Tenth Amendment as the Source of State Sovereign Immunity	486
	<i>Alden v. Maine</i>	486
H.	OTHER FEDERAL REGULATORY POWERS: THE NATURALIZATION, WAR, AND TREATY POWERS	497
1.	The Naturalization Power	498
a.	The Naturalization Power	498
	<i>United States v. Wong Kim Ark</i>	499
	Note: Citizenship and Naturalization	511
b.	The Power to Regulate Immigration	511
	<i>Chae Chan Ping v. United States</i>	512
	<i>Fiallo. v. Bell</i>	518
	Note: The Immigration Power	522
2.	The War Power	523
	<i>Hamilton v. Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Co.</i>	523
3.	The Treaty Power	526
	<i>Missouri v. Holland</i>	527
	Note: The Effect of Treaty Obligations and the Question of Non-Self- Executing Treaties	530
	<i>Medellin v. Texas</i>	530
I.	THE TAXING AND SPENDING POWER AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO REGULATION	541
1.	The General Scope of the Power	542
	<i>Sonzinsky v. United States</i>	543
2.	The Spending Power as a Means of Influencing State Government Conduct	544
	<i>South Dakota v. Dole</i>	545

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter III	THE DISTRIBUTION OF NATIONAL POWERS	551
A.	SUMMARY	551
1.	Introduction	551
2.	Presidential Authority in Foreign Affairs	551
3.	Presidential Immunity From Judicial Process	551
4.	Congressional Power to Delegate Legislative Power	552
5.	The President and the Bureaucracy	552
6.	The War Power	553
B.	FOUNDATIONAL CONCEPTS	553
	Note: Introduction to the Separation of Powers	553
	Note: The Background of the <i>Youngstown</i> Case	555
	<i>Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer (Steel Seizure Case)</i>	556
	Note: Formalism and Functionalism in Separation of Powers Analysis	567
C.	LOCATING THE CONSTITUTIONAL BOUNDARIES OF EXECUTIVE POWER	569
1.	Foreign Affairs	569
	Note: <i>United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.</i> and the Expansiveness of Inherent Executive Power in Foreign Affairs	569
	<i>Dames & Moore v. Regan</i>	570
2.	Presidential Immunities	573
	Note: Presidential Immunities up to <i>United States v. Nixon</i>	573
	<i>United States v. Nixon</i>	575
	Note: The Reach of the Presidential Immunity Between <i>Nixon</i> and <i>Clinton v. Jones</i>	582
	<i>Clinton v. Jones</i>	583
D.	DEFINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE BUREAUCRACY	588
1.	Limits on Congressional Authority to Delegate Legislative Power	588
	Note: The Evolution of the Non-Delegation Doctrine	588
	<i>Yakus v. United States</i>	590
	Note: The Non-Delegation Doctrine in the Modern Era	593
	<i>Whitman v. American Trucking Ass'ns</i>	594
2.	Congressional Control Over Delegated Power	599
	<i>Immigration And Naturalization Service v. Chadha</i>	599
	Note: Continued Legislative Oversight over the Bureaucracy	613
E.	EXECUTIVE CONTROL OVER THE BUREAUCRACY	614
	<i>Morrison v. Olson</i>	614
	<i>Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board</i>	626
	Note: Congressional “Aggrandizement,” “Incongruous” Appointments, and	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Other Aspects of Executive Control Over the Bureaucracy	645
F.	ALLOCATING THE POWER BETWEEN THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT TO MAKE WAR	647
1.	The War Power Before the War Powers Resolution	647
	Note: The War Power in Theory, History and Practice	647
2.	The War Powers Resolution	649
	War Powers Resolution	650
	Note: The War Powers Resolution in Practice	652
	AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION	653
	STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH UPON SIGNING H. J. RES. 77	654
3.	Executive Authority and the War on Terror	655
	AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE	655
	<i>Hamdi v. Rumsfeld</i>	656
	Note: From <i>Hamdi</i> to <i>Boumediene</i>	665
	<i>Boumediene v. Bush</i>	666
Chapter IV	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES	693
A.	THE CONSTITUTION AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS	693
1.	The Constitution	693
2.	The Bill of Rights	694
	<i>Barron v. Mayor And City Council Of Baltimore</i>	696
	Note: On the Way to “Incorporation”	697
B.	THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS DOCTRINE	697
	<i>Slaughter-House Cases</i>	698
	Note: Reflections on <i>Slaughter-House</i> and the Privileges or Immunities Clause	707
C.	THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS DOCTRINE — RECOGNIZING IMPLIED FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS IN THE LIBERTY PROTECTED BY THE CLAUSE	707
1.	Economic or Contract Rights	708
	<i>Lochner v. New York</i>	708
	Note: The <i>Lochner</i> Doctrine in Practice	712
	<i>Muller v. Oregon</i>	713
2.	Origins of Modern Substantive Due Process — Parental Autonomy Rights	715
	<i>Meyer v. Nebraska</i>	715
	Note: Liberty, Due Process and the Right of Parents to Control the Upbringing and Education of Their Children	717
3.	Abandonment of Substantive Due Process Protection for Economic	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Rights	718
	<i>Nebbia v. New York</i>	718
	Notes on <i>Nebbia</i> and Deference to Legislative Judgments	720
	<i>West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish</i>	720
	Note: The Most Famous Footnote in Supreme Court History	725
	<i>United States v. Carolene Products Co.</i>	726
D.	APPLICATION OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS TO THE STATES — THE INCORPORATION CONTROVERSY	727
	<i>Palko v. Connecticut</i>	728
	Note: Selective Incorporation, Total Incorporation or Fundamental Rights?	730
	<i>Adamson v. California</i>	731
	Note: Selective Incorporation of Rights Fundamental to the American Scheme of Justice	736
	<i>McDonald v. Chicago</i>	737
E.	PERSON — WHO CONSTITUTES A PERSON FOR PURPOSES OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS?	760
	1. Corporations	761
	2. Noncitizens	761
	3. Other Candidates for Personhood?	762
F.	MODERN FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES DOCTRINE	763
	<i>Saenz v. Roe</i>	763
Chapter V		
	DUE PROCESS	769
A.	INTRODUCTION	769
B.	ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL REGULATION — THE MINIMAL GUARANTEE OF DUE PROCESS PROTECTION AGAINST IRRATIONAL OR ARBITRARY REGULATION	771
	<i>Williamson v. Lee Optical Of Oklahoma, Inc.</i>	771
	Note: Deference to Legislatures — Privacy and the War on Drugs . . .	773
	<i>Whalen v. Roe</i>	773
	Note: Due Process Protection Limiting Award of Punitive Damages in Tort Actions	774
C.	RIGHTS OR LIBERTIES ENTITLED TO HEIGHTENED PROTECTION UNDER THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE	774
	1. Theoretical Underpinnings — A Right to Privacy	776
	<i>Griswold v. Connecticut</i>	776
	Note: <i>Griswold</i> and the Right to Privacy	786
	2. A Right to Marry	787
	<i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	788
	Note: The Right to Marry: Child Support Obligations and Prison	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Inmates	788
	Note: A Right to Marry But, Perhaps, Not to Live Together in the United States?	790
	Note: A Right to Marry a Person of the Same Sex	791
3.	The Right to Terminate a Pregnancy	793
	<i>Roe v. Wade</i>	793
	Note: Implementing <i>Roe v. Wade</i>	802
	<i>Planned Parenthood Of South-eastern Pennsylvania v. Casey</i>	804
	Note: Implementing <i>Casey</i>	830
	<i>Gonzales v. Carhart</i>	831
	Note: Regulation of Abortion	846
4.	The Right of Parents to Raise Their Children	847
	<i>Troxel v. Granville</i>	847
	Note: Nonmarital Parents	857
	<i>Michael H. v. Gerald D.</i>	858
	Note: A Child’s Liberty Interest	869
5.	The Right of a Family to Live Together	870
	<i>Moore v. City Of East Cleveland</i>	870
6.	The Right to Bodily Integrity and Autonomy	876
	<i>Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department Of Health</i>	876
	<i>Washington v. Glucksberg</i>	886
	Note: A Right to Bodily Integrity that Includes Physician Assisted Suicide?	895
7.	A Right to Intimacy	895
	<i>Lawrence v. Texas</i>	895
D.	PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS	904
1.	Introduction	904
2.	Protected Interests — What Constitutes a Protected Liberty or Property Interest?	905
	<i>Board Of Regents Of State Colleges v. Roth</i>	905
	Note: A Protected Property Interest in Police Enforcement of Protective Orders?	910
	<i>Town Of Castle Rock, Colorado v. Gonzales</i>	911
	Note: Noncitizens Admitted to Permanent Residence in the United States	923
	<i>Landon v. Plasencia</i>	923
3.	What Process Is Due?	926
	<i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i>	926
	Notes and Questions	935

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter VI	THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE: EQUALITY CONCEPTS	937
A.	THE GUARANTEE OF EQUALITY — TREATING SIMILARLY SITUATED INDIVIDUALS EQUALLY	937
B.	SLAVERY, RACE AND THE UNION	938
1.	Slavery	938
2.	The Constitution and Slavery	939
3.	Territorial Expansion and the Growing Division between North and South over Slavery	945
4.	Slavery in the Supreme Court	947
	<i>Dred Scott v. Sandford</i>	948
	Note: <i>Dred Scott's</i> Place in Constitutional Law	953
5.	Slavery and Civil War	954
6.	Reconstruction and the Reconstruction Amendments	955
	<i>Strauder v. West Virginia</i>	958
	Note: State Action, Private Actors, and Equality	960
7.	Beyond Slavery — Race in a Broader Context	960
	<i>Yick Wo v. Hopkins</i>	961
8.	Segregation of the Races: Separate But Equal?	964
	<i>Plessy v. Ferguson</i>	964
	Note: Separate but Equal	968
C.	MODERN EQUAL PROTECTION DOCTRINE: CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON RACE, COLOR AND NATIONAL ORIGIN	970
	<i>Korematsu v. United States</i>	970
	<i>Ex Parte Mitsuye Endo</i>	979
1.	Why Heightened Scrutiny for Classifications Based on Race, Color and National Origin?	983
	<i>Brown v. Board Of Education (Brown I)</i>	984
	<i>Bolling v. Sharpe</i>	986
2.	The School Desegregation Cases — Eliminating the Vestiges of Past Discrimination	987
	<i>Brown v. Board Of Education (Brown II)</i>	987
	Note: Southern Resistance to Desegregation	988
	<i>Green v. County School Board Of New Kent County</i>	989
	<i>Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board Of Education Et Al.</i>	993
	<i>Milliken v. Bradley (Milliken I)</i>	999
	<i>Milliken v. Bradley (Milliken II)</i>	1008
	Note: Eliminating the Vestiges of Segregation “To the Extent Practicable”	1013
	<i>Freeman v. Pitts</i>	1014
	<i>Missouri v. Jenkins</i>	1017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

a.	Extending the Logic of <i>Brown</i> — Invidious Racial Discrimination in Other Contexts	1022
i.	Juries	1022
	<i>Hernandez v. Texas</i>	1022
	Note: Racial Discrimination in Jury Selection — Peremptory Challenges	1025
ii.	Interracial Marriage	1026
	<i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	1026
iii.	Child Custody	1027
	<i>Palmore v. Sidoti</i>	1027
3.	The Requirement of Discriminatory Purpose	1030
a.	Invidious Intent and Facially Neutral Statutes	1030
	<i>Washington v. Davis</i>	1031
b.	How to Prove Discriminatory Intent?	1034
	<i>Village Of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corp.</i>	1034
c.	Individualized Proof of Discriminatory Intent	1035
	<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i>	1035
	Note: A Critique of the Discriminatory Intent Requirement	1042
d.	Facially Neutral Schemes That Cannot Be Explained Other Than as the Result of Discriminatory Intent	1043
	<i>Miller v. Johnson</i>	1045
	Note: Implementing <i>Miller</i> and the Use of Race in Districting	1056
D.	RACE-CONSCIOUS AFFIRMATIVE ACTION	1056
1.	Race Conscious Measures in Public Contracts — the Modern View	1059
	<i>City Of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.</i>	1059
	Note: Congressional Power to Enact Race Conscious Measures	1069
	<i>Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena</i>	1071
2.	Race Conscious Measures in Higher Education — Diversity as a Compelling Interest	1081
	<i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i>	1081
	Note: What Constitutes a Narrowly Tailored Admissions Policy?	1103
3.	Race Conscious Measures in Schools — <i>Brown I</i> and Desegregation Revisited	1106
	<i>Parents Involved In Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1</i>	1106
E.	GENDER-BASED DISCRIMINATION	1133
1.	Traditional Stereotypes About Women and Equality	1133
2.	From Rational Basis Scrutiny to Intermediate Scrutiny	1134
	<i>Frontiero v. Richardson</i>	1135
	<i>Craig v. Boren</i>	1139

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.	“Real” Differences or Stereotypes?	1143
	<i>Michael M. v. Superior Court Of Sonoma County</i>	1143
	<i>Rostker v. Goldberg</i>	1149
	Note: Gender Based Classifications and Military Necessity	1155
	<i>United States v. Virginia</i>	1156
	<i>Nguyen v. Immigration And Naturalization Service</i>	1168
4.	Facially Neutral Gender Classification Schemes — The Requirement of Intent	1187
	<i>Personnel Administrator Of Massachusetts v. Feeney</i>	1187
	Note: Gender Discrimination in Jury Selection — Peremptory Challenges	1190
F.	RATIONAL BASIS SCRUTINY — THE EQUALITY GUARANTEE	1190
	<i>Railway Express Agency v. New York</i>	1190
	Note: Over-Inclusiveness and Under-Inclusiveness	1193
	<i>Massachusetts Board Of Retirement v. Murgia</i>	1194
1.	Illegitimate Purposes? — When Legislatures Are Motivated by Animus Towards Groups	1198
	<i>City Of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center</i>	1198
	<i>Romer v. Evans</i>	1205
G.	IDENTIFICATION OF OTHER GROUPS WARRANTING CLOSER SCRUTINY	1211
1.	Classifications Distinguishing Citizens and Noncitizens: Alienage	1211
a.	Discrimination on the Basis of Citizenship at the State Level	1212
i.	Noncitizens Who Have Been Admitted to the United States	1212
	<i>Graham v. Richardson</i>	1212
	<i>Sugarman v. Dougall</i>	1216
	<i>In Re Griffiths</i>	1218
	Note: The Political Function Exception to the Anti-Discrimination Norm	1222
ii.	Noncitizens in the United States Without Authorization	1223
	<i>Plyler v. Doe</i>	1223
b.	Discrimination on the Basis of Citizenship at the Federal Level	1234
	<i>Mathews v. Diaz</i>	1234
	Note: The Intersection of Citizenship and Race, National Origin or Color	1238
c.	Nonmarital Status	1238
i.	Nonmarital Children	1238
ii.	Nonmarital Fathers	1239
d.	Wealth	1240
H.	THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS STRAND OF EQUAL PROTECTION — RIGHT TO MARRY, TRAVEL, VOTING, EDUCATION AND PRIVACY	1241

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	The Right to Marry	1242
	<i>Skinner v. Oklahoma</i>	1242
	<i>Zablocki v. Redhail</i>	1246
2.	The Right to Travel	1251
	<i>Shapiro v. Thompson</i>	1251
	<i>Regan v. Wald</i>	1260
	Note: Developments in the Right to Interstate Travel	1262
3.	Voting	1263
	<i>Reynolds v. Sims</i>	1264
	Note: One-Person One-Vote and The Voting Rights Act of 1965	1269
4.	Education	1270
	<i>San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez</i>	1270
	Note: Public School Financing and Education Inequalities	1281
	<i>Plyler v. Doe</i>	1281
5.	Right to Assisted Suicide	1285
	<i>Vacco v. Quill</i>	1285
Chapter VII	CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO ENFORCE THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT	1291
<hr/>		
	<i>Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer</i>	1291
	Note: The Enforcement Power Before <i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i>	1291
	<i>City Of Boerne v. Flores</i>	1294
	Note: Applying the “Congruence and Proportionality” Standard	1306
	<i>Board Of Trustees Of The University Of Alabama v. Garrett</i>	1306
	<i>Nevada Dept Of Human Resources v. Hibbs</i>	1320
	Note: The Enforcement Clause After <i>Garrett</i> and <i>Hibbs</i>	1329
	Note: The State Action Requirement and the Enforcement Clause	1331
Chapter VIII	ECONOMIC RIGHTS	1333
<hr/>		
A.	THE CONTRACT CLAUSE	1333
	<i>Dartmouth College v. Woodward</i>	1333
	Note: Recognition of Substantive Due Process	1334
	Note: Modern Contract Clause	1334
1.	State Regulation of Private Contracts	1335
a.	Determining When State Regulations Violate the Contract Clause	1335
b.	Abridgment of Existing Contractual Obligations	1336
	<i>Allied Structural Steel Co. v. Spannaus</i>	1337
c.	Revisiting State Regulation of Existing Contractual Obligations — Laws of General Applicability Designed to Advance Broad Societal Interests	1340
	<i>Exxon Corp. v. Eagerton</i>	1340
2.	Public Contracts	1342

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>United States Trust Co. Of New York v. New Jersey</i>	1343
B.	THE TAKING CLAUSE	1346
1.	When Is a Taking for Public Use?	1347
	<i>Kelo v. City Of New London</i>	1347
2.	Is There a Taking?	1353
a.	Physical Occupation of Property	1353
b.	Regulatory Takings	1353
	<i>Penn Central Transportation Co. v. City Of New York</i>	1354
	Note: The State’s Regulatory Power to Deal with Nuisance, Risk and Environmental Problems	1360
	<i>Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council</i>	1360
	Note: Regulatory Takings and Property Development	1367
3.	Just Compensation	1368
Chapter IX	THE SECOND AMENDMENT: A RIGHT TO POSSESS GUNS	1369
	<i>District Of Columbia v. Heller</i>	1369
	Note: Implementing <i>Heller</i>	1402
Chapter X	STATE ACTION	1405
A.	THE REQUIREMENT OF STATE ACTION	1405
	<i>The Civil Rights Cases</i>	1406
	<i>United States v. Morrison</i>	1408
B.	WHAT CONSTITUTES STATE ACTION?	1413
1.	Traditional Government Functions	1414
a.	Company Towns	1414
	<i>Marsh v. Alabama</i>	1414
b.	Shopping Centers	1416
c.	Party Primaries	1418
	<i>Terry v. Adams</i>	1419
d.	Utility Service	1423
	<i>Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Company</i>	1423
e.	Education	1428
2.	State Involvement, Encouragement, Coercion, or Entwinement	1428
	<i>Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority</i>	1428
	<i>Shelley v. Kraemer</i>	1432
a.	State Involvement or Entwinement in Private Segregation	1436
b.	State Involvement Insufficient to Constitute State Action — Liquor Licensing	1439
	<i>Moose Lodge v. Irvis</i>	1439
	Note: State Involvement in Licensing Radio Broadcasting	1442

TABLE OF CONTENTS

c.	State Involvement Through Funding — Coercion or Symbiotic Relationship?	1445
	<i>Rendell-Baker v. Kohn</i>	1445
	Note: State Involvement in Athletic Associations	1450
d.	Private Actors Relying on State Law in the Commercial Context — Traditional State Function or State Involvement?	1453
	<i>Flagg Brothers, Inc. v. Brooks</i>	1453
	<i>American Mfrs. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan</i>	1459
	Note: Garnishment and Prejudgment Attachment Procedures — Where the State Is a Willful Participant	1464
e.	State Failure to Enforce Law or Protect Those Over Whom It Has Exercised Some Control as State Action?	1465
	<i>Deshaney v. Winnebago Cty Soc. Servs. Dept.</i>	1465
f.	Entwinement Revisited	1475
	<i>Brentwood Academy v. Tennessee Secondary School Athletic Ass.</i>	1475
Appendix		
	United States Constitution	APP-1
Table of Cases		TC-1
Index		I-1
