

# Constitutional Law



# Constitutional Law

---

## Cases, Approaches, and Applications

THIRD EDITION

**William D. Araiza**

STANLEY A. AUGUST PROFESSOR OF LAW  
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

---

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2025  
William D. Araiza  
All Rights Reserved

LCCN: 2024950994  
ISBN: 978-1-5310-2571-7  
eISBN: 978-1-5310-2572-4

Carolina Academic Press  
700 Kent Street  
Durham, North Carolina 27701  
(919) 489-7486  
[www.cap-press.com](http://www.cap-press.com)

Printed in the United States of America

---

---

# Contents

---

---

Online Materials	xvii
About This Book	xix
A Note on Editing	xxi
Introduction	xxiii
1. The Scope of the Material	xxiii
2. An Overview of the Material	xxiv
3. The Unlitigated Constitution	xxvii
4. Methods of Constitutional Interpretation	xxix
5. Setting the Scene: The Constitutional System in 1787	xxx
The Constitution of the United States of America	xxxii

## PART I • THE BRANCHES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Chapter 1 • The Judicial Power	3
A. The Power “to Say What the Law Is”	3
Note: The Scope of “the Judicial Power” and the Lead-Up to <i>Marbury</i>	3
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i>	6
Note: Questions about Judicial Review	15
<i>Cooper v. Aaron</i>	19
Note: Post- <i>Cooper</i> Challenges to the Supreme Court’s Interpretive Supremacy	20
Note: <i>Marbury</i> and “the Power to Say What the Law Is”	21
B. Congressional Checks on the Judicial Power	23
1. Jurisdiction	24
Note: The Background to <i>Ex parte McCardle</i> , <i>Ex parte Yerger</i> , and <i>United States v. Klein</i>	24
<i>Ex parte McCardle</i>	24
Note: <i>Ex parte Yerger</i> and <i>United States v. Klein</i>	26

Note: Jurisdiction-Stripping Statutes in the Modern Era	29
Note: Article I Courts	29
2. Other Means of Congressional Control over the Courts	35
Note: Congressional Power to “Prescribe Rules of Decision”	35
<i>Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm</i>	37
Note: The Emerging Picture of Article III	45
C. Self-Imposed Limits on the Judicial Power	46
1. The Political Question Doctrine	47
<i>Baker v. Carr</i>	47
Note: Textual Commitments of Decisions to Other Branches	55
<i>Nixon v. United States</i>	55
2. The Case or Controversy Requirement	62
a. Advisory Opinions	62
<i>Muskrat v. United States</i>	62
b. Standing	64
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i>	66
Note: Applying the Injury, Causation, and Redressability Requirements	77
<i>Singleton v. Wulff</i>	82
Note: “An Incidental Congruity of Interest”	85
Note: The Congressional Role in Standing	86
<i>TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez</i>	89
Note: The “Injury in Fact” Requirement	99
Note: The Limits of Standing	100
c. Ripeness	105
<i>United Public Workers v. Mitchell</i>	106
<i>Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner</i>	108
Note: Applying the Ripeness Requirement	111
d. Mootness	112
<i>DeFunis v. Odegaard</i>	113
Note: Abortion Rights Claims and Mootness	117
Note: Recent Applications of the Mootness Doctrine	117
<b>Chapter 2 • The Distribution of National Regulatory Powers</b>	<b>121</b>
A. Foundational Concepts	121
Note: Introduction to the Separation of Powers	121
Note: The Background of the Youngstown Case	123
<i>Youngstown Sheet &amp; Tube Co. v. Sawyer</i> (Steel Seizure Case)	124
Note: Formalism and Functionalism in Separation of Powers Analysis	134
B. Presidential Immunity from Judicial Process	135
Note: Presidential Immunities up to <i>United States v. Nixon</i>	136
<i>United States v. Nixon</i>	137
Note: Presidential Immunities from <i>Nixon</i> to <i>Trump</i>	142

<i>Trump v. United States</i>	147
Note: The Theory and Scope of Presidential Immunity in <i>Trump</i>	163
C. Congress, the President, and the Administrative State	165
1. Limits on Congressional Authority to Delegate Legislative Power	165
Note: The Evolution of the Non-Delegation Doctrine	165
<i>Yakus v. United States</i>	167
Note: The Nondelegation Doctrine Since 1935	171
<i>Gundy v. United States</i>	174
Note: <i>Gundy</i> and the Future of the Non-Delegation Doctrine	188
2. Congressional Control over Delegated Power	190
<i>Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Chadha</i>	190
Note: Continued Legislative Oversight over the Bureaucracy	201
Note: The Non-Delegation Doctrine and the Legislative Veto	202
3. Executive Control over the Bureaucracy	203
Note: <i>Myers</i> and <i>Humphrey's</i> Executor	203
<i>Morrison v. Olson</i>	206
Note: <i>Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB</i>	217
<i>Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</i>	219
Note: The Current Status of the Removal Power	236
Note: Congressional "Aggrandizement," "Incongruous"	
Appointments, and Other Aspects of Executive	
Control over the Bureaucracy	237
Note: The Separation of Powers in Domestic Affairs	239
D. Foreign Affairs and the War Powers	240
1. Foreign Affairs	240
Note: <i>United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.</i> and the	
Expansiveness of Inherent Executive Power in Foreign Affairs	240
<i>Dames &amp; Moore v. Regan</i>	242
Note: Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic Recognition, and a (Rare)	
Category Three Win for the Presidency	245
2. The War Power	248
a. General Concepts	248
Note: The War Power in Theory, History, and Practice	248
Note: The War Powers Resolution	250
War Powers Resolution	251
Note: The War Powers Resolution in Practice	253
Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq Resolution	254
Statement by President George Bush upon Signing H.J. Res. 77	255
b. Presidential Authority and the War on Terror	256
Authorization for Use of Military Force	256
Note: The Detainee Cases	257
c. The War Power in a World of Small Wars	262
Authority to Use Military Force in Libya	263
Note: The Foreign Affairs and War Powers	268

**PART II • THE DIVISION OF FEDERAL AND  
STATE REGULATORY POWER**

Introduction	271
<b>Chapter 3 • Federal Law, Federal Institutions, and Federal Supremacy</b>	<b>273</b>
Note: The Flaws of the Articles of Confederation	273
<i>Martin v. Hunter's Lessee</i>	274
Note: <i>Cohens v. Virginia</i>	278
<i>McCulloch v. Maryland</i>	279
<i>U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton</i>	283
Note: History and Logic in the Federal Sovereignty Cases	292
<b>Chapter 4 • Congress's Regulatory Powers</b>	<b>295</b>
A. Federal Power under the Necessary and Proper Clause	295
<i>McCulloch v. Maryland</i>	295
Note: Modern Applications of the Necessary and Proper Clause	303
B. Federal Power to Regulate Interstate Commerce	305
1. Seminal Principles and Early Doctrinal Development	306
<i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i>	306
Note: State Laws and the Development of Commerce Clause Doctrine in the Nineteenth Century	310
2. Increased Federal Regulation — and Judicial Resistance	312
<i>United States v. E.C. Knight Co.</i>	312
<i>Swift &amp; Co. v. United States</i>	318
Note: Commerce Clause Analysis up to 1937	319
3. The Evolution of Expanded Federal Power	322
<i>NLRB v. Jones &amp; Laughlin Steel Corp.</i>	322
Note: The Aftermath of <i>Jones &amp; Laughlin</i>	327
<i>United States v. Darby</i>	328
<i>Wickard v. Filburn</i>	333
Note: The Commerce Clause at Its Height	338
4. A More Limited Commerce Power	341
<i>United States v. Lopez</i>	342
Note: The Congressional Response to <i>Lopez</i>	358
Note: <i>United States v. Morrison</i> and the Role of Congressional Fact Finding	358
<i>Gonzales v. Raich</i>	359
Note: <i>National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius</i> and the Constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act under the Commerce Clause	372
Note: The Current State of the Commerce Clause	375



<b>Chapter 5 • Residual State Powers — and Their Limits</b>	<b>377</b>
A. The Commerce Clause as a Limitation on State Regulatory Power	377
1. Early Analysis and the Evolution of the Modern Rule	378
Note: The Court’s Early Analysis	378
2. The Evolution of the Modern Rule	379
a. Heightened Scrutiny for Discriminatory Laws	380
<i>Baldwin v. G.A.F. Seelig, Inc.</i>	380
<i>Dean Milk Co. v. Madison</i>	381
b. Balancing Local Benefits and Interstate Burdens	385
<i>South Carolina State Highway Department v. Barnwell Bros.</i>	385
<i>Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona</i>	388
Note: Interstate Traffic and the Evolution of the Dormant Commerce Clause	392
3. Modern Applications	393
<i>C.A. Carbone, Inc. v. City of Clarkstown, N.Y.</i>	394
Note: Identifying Discrimination	409
Note: <i>National Pork Producers Council v. Ross</i> ,	
Extraterritoriality, and Pike Balancing	411
Note: More on Discrimination and Strict Scrutiny	413
Note: The State as a Market Participant and Provider of Government Services	415
4. The Limits of the Doctrine — and Critiques	417
Note: The Limits of Political Process Theory	417
Note: Critiques of Benefit-Burden “Balancing” and the Dormant Commerce Clause Generally	418
Note: Evaluating the Dormant Commerce Clause	423
B. Interstate Privileges and Immunities	424
<i>Supreme Court of New Hampshire v. Piper</i>	425
C. Federal Preemption of State Law	435
Note: Introduction to Preemption Doctrine	435
<i>Gade v. National Solid Wastes Management Association</i>	436
Note: Preemption Analysis	446
 <b>Chapter 6 • Federal Regulation of the States</b>	 <b>449</b>
A. Regulation of the States as Economic Actors	450
Note: From <i>Wirtz</i> to <i>Garcia</i>	450
B. The Prohibition on “Commandeering”	454
Note: The Precursors to the Anti-Commandeering Doctrine	454
<i>New York v. United States</i>	456
Note: The Scope — and Limits — of the “Anti-Commandeering” Doctrine	473

Note: Commandeering or Preemption?	475
C. Constitutional Limits on Judicial Remedies against States	478
1. The Young Doctrine	479
<i>Edelman v. Jordan</i>	479
<i>Pennhurst State School &amp; Hospital v. Halderman</i>	485
Note: Further Limitations on <i>Young</i> Relief	494
Note: The Meaning of <i>Ex parte Young</i>	497
2. State “Waiver” of Sovereign Immunity	497
<i>Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer</i>	497
Note: <i>Pennsylvania v. Union Gas and Congress’s</i> Article I	
Authority to Abrogate State Sovereign Immunity	499
<i>Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida</i>	501
Note: Article I Power to Abrogate State Sovereign Immunity	
after <i>Seminole Tribe</i>	511
Note: The Tenth Amendment as a Source of State Sovereign	
Immunity	513
Note: The Scope of State Sovereignty	515
D. The Taxing and Spending Power as an Alternative to Regulation	516
1. The General Scope of the Federal Government’s Fiscal Powers	516
<i>Sonzinsky v. United States</i>	518
Note: <i>National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius</i>	
and the Taxing Power	519
2. Inter-governmental Tax Immunities	521
Note: Inter-Governmental Tax Immunities	521
3. The Spending Power as a Means of Influencing State Government	
Conduct	523
<i>South Dakota v. Dole</i>	523
Note: <i>National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius</i>	
and the Medicaid Expansion	528
Note: Distinguishing Inducement from “a Gun to the Head”	529

### PART III • SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS UNDER THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE

Introduction	531
Note: A False Start	532
 Chapter 7 • The Rise and Fall of Economic Due Process	 535
<i>Munn v. Illinois</i>	535
Note: <i>Munn</i> , The Police Power, and Businesses “Affected with	
a Public Interest”	541
Note: “The Police Power,” “Class Legislation,” and the Rise of	
“Liberty of Contract”	541
<i>Lochner v. New York</i>	544

Note: “The Lochner Era”	551
<i>Nebbia v. New York</i>	552
Note: From <i>Nebbia</i> to <i>West Coast Hotel</i>	558
<i>West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish</i>	559
Note: Economic Due Process after 1937	563
<i>Ferguson v. Skrupa</i>	564
<b>Chapter 8 • The Development of Non-Economic Liberties</b>	<b>567</b>
A. Unenumerated Rights to Liberty	567
<i>Meyer v. Nebraska</i>	567
Note: From Parenting to Procreation	570
B. Incorporation of the Bill of Rights	572
Note: The Early History of Incorporation	572
<i>Palko v. Connecticut</i>	573
<i>Adamson v. California</i>	576
Note: Incorporated Right or Unenumerated Liberty?	582
Note: The Current State of Incorporation	582
Note: Justice Harlan’s Dissent in <i>Poe v. Ullman</i> and the State of Due Process Liberty on the Eve of <i>Griswold</i>	584
<b>Chapter 9 • The Right to an Abortion</b>	<b>587</b>
A. The Foundations	587
<i>Griswold v. Connecticut</i>	587
Note: <i>Eisenstadt v. Baird</i>	594
B. Roe and Its Aftermath	595
<i>Roe v. Wade</i>	595
Note: <i>Roe v. Wade</i>	603
Note: From <i>Roe</i> to <i>Casey</i>	604
C. The End of the Abortion Right	605
Note: <i>Casey</i> and the Continued Resistance to the Abortion Right	605
<i>Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization</i>	609
Note: <i>Roe v. Wade</i> , 1973–2022	630
<b>Chapter 10 • Modern Due Process Methodologies</b>	<b>633</b>
Note: Due Process Methodologies	633
<i>Moore v. City of East Cleveland</i>	634
<i>Michael H. v. Gerald D.</i>	646
<i>Washington v. Glucksberg</i>	658
Note: Due Process Analysis in <i>Moore</i> , <i>Michael H.</i> , and <i>Glucksberg</i>	675
Note: <i>Bowers v. Hardwick</i>	676
<i>Lawrence v. Texas</i>	678
Note: <i>Lawrence</i> and Its Ambiguities	691
Note: The Path to <i>Obergefell</i> and Same-Sex Marriage	693

<i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i>	695
Note: The State of Due Process Jurisprudence Today	719
Note: Post- <i>Dobbs</i> Due Process Analysis	726
 <b>PART IV • CONSTITUTIONAL EQUALITY</b>	
Note: Equality Before Equal Protection	731
 <b>Chapter 11 • Equal Protection and Social and Economic Regulation</b>	<b>733</b>
A. Equal Protection and the Police Power	733
Note: Equality, Due Process, and the Police Power	733
<i>Barbier v. Connolly</i>	735
<i>Borden's Farm Products Co., Inc. v. Ten Eyck</i>	736
<i>Mayflower Farms, Inc. v. Ten Eyck</i>	740
Note: The Difficulties of Police Power/Class Legislation	
Jurisprudence	743
Note: Equal Protection and Race in the Class Legislation Era	744
B. The Modern Doctrine	745
Note: Equal Protection and the Revolution of 1937	745
<i>Railway Express Agency v. People of the State of New York</i>	746
<i>United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz</i>	748
Note: Continued Unease With Differential Scrutiny?	758
 <b>Chapter 12 • Suspect Classes and Suspect Class Analysis</b>	<b>763</b>
Note: "The Most Celebrated Footnote in Constitutional Law"	763
Note: Footnote 4 and Race	766
A. Sex Discrimination	768
Note: Sex Discrimination Jurisprudence before <i>Frontiero v. Richardson</i>	
<i>Richardson</i>	769
<i>Frontiero v. Richardson</i>	770
Note: Litigating Sex Equality from <i>Reed</i> to <i>Craig</i>	775
<i>Craig v. Boren</i>	776
Note: The Equal Rights Amendment	784
Note: What Does Intermediate Scrutiny Mean?	785
<i>United States v. Virginia</i>	788
Note: Virginia and the "Exceedingly Persuasive Justification"	
Requirement	801
Note: "Real Differences" Redux?	801
<i>Sessions v. Morales-Santana</i>	802
Note: The Analysis in <i>Morales-Santana</i>	808
B. Legitimacy	809
Note: The Court's Early Legitimacy Cases	809
<i>Mathews v. Lucas</i>	812
<i>Clark v. Jeter</i>	819
Note: The Suspectness of Illegitimacy	821

C. Alienage	822
Note: Early Alienage Cases	822
<i>Sugarman v. Dougall</i>	823
Note: The Political Function Exception	828
Note: State Classification against Undocumented Immigrants	830
Note: Federal Power to Discriminate against Aliens	831
D. Unsuccessful Candidates for Heightened Scrutiny	833
Note: Wealth as a Suspect Class?	833
<i>Massachusetts Board of Retirement v. Murgia</i>	837
Note: The Court and Suspect Class Analysis	841
<b>Chapter 13 · Race and the Constitution</b>	<b>843</b>
A. The Constitution and Slavery	843
Note: The Constitution's Compromise with Slavery	843
<i>Dred Scott v. Sandford</i>	845
Note: The Slavery Debate after <i>Dred Scott</i>	851
B. Equal Protection and Race before 1937	852
Note: The Early Post-Slavery Decades	852
<i>Plessy v. Ferguson</i>	853
Note: Separate but Equal before <i>Brown</i>	858
C. Dismantling Jim Crow	861
1. The Run-Up to <i>Brown</i>	861
<i>Korematsu v. United States</i>	861
Note: “Gravely Wrong the Day It Was Decided”	866
Note: The Political and Social Backdrop to <i>Brown</i>	866
2. <i>Brown</i> and Its Implementation	867
<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i> (“Brown I”)	867
<i>Bolling v. Sharpe</i>	870
Note: <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>	871
<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i> (“Brown II”)	873
Note: Resistance to <i>Brown</i>	875
Declaration of Constitutional Principles	875
Note: The Struggle to Implement <i>Brown</i>	877
3. The Implications of <i>Brown</i>	880
Note: <i>Naim</i> and the <i>Per Curiam</i> s	880
<i>Muir v. Louisville Park Theatrical Association</i>	881
<i>Mayor and City Council of Baltimore v. Dawson</i>	881
<i>Holmes v. City of Atlanta</i>	881
<i>Gayle v. Browder</i>	881
<i>New Orleans City Park Improvement Association v. Detiege</i>	881
<i>Turner v. City of Memphis</i>	882
<i>Johnson v. Virginia</i>	883
<i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	884
D. Can Race Be a Benign Criterion?	887

Note: An Introduction to “Affirmative Action”	887
<i>Regents of the University of California v. Bakke</i>	888
Note: The Debate in <i>Bakke</i>	911
Note: From <i>Bakke</i> to <i>Croson</i>	911
<i>City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.</i>	913
Note: A Different Standard for Race-Conscious Federal Action?	925
Note: Affirmative Action in Education Between <i>Bakke</i> and <i>Students for Fair Admissions</i>	933
<i>Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College</i>	936
Note: SFFA and the Role of Race in Higher Education Admissions	957
<b>Chapter 14 · The Intent Requirement</b>	<b>959</b>
Note: An Introduction to the Intent Requirement	959
<i>Washington v. Davis</i>	960
Note: “The Arlington Heights Factors”	964
Note: “Because of, Not in Spite of”	966
Note: When Does Impact Matter?	968
<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i>	969
Note: The Eighth Amendment, Disparate Impact, and Inequality	975
Note: The Intent Requirement	979
<b>Chapter 15 · Equal Protection Analysis Today</b>	<b>981</b>
Note: “A Bare . . . Desire to Harm a Politically Unpopular Group”	981
<i>City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center</i>	982
Note: <i>Cleburne</i> , Suspect Class Analysis and Rational Basis Review	998
<i>Romer v. Evans</i>	999
Note: Justice O’Connor’s Concurrence in <i>Lawrence v. Texas</i>	1012
Note: <i>United States v. Windsor</i>	1017
Note: The Animus “Doctrine”(?)	1022
<b>Chapter 16 · Equal Protection Fundamental Rights</b>	<b>1025</b>
<i>Zablocki v. Redhail</i>	1025
Note: Identifying Equal Protection Fundamental Rights	1033
Note: The Current Status of the Fundamental Rights Strand of Equal Protection	1034
Note: Liberty and Equality Today	1035
<b>PART V · GENERAL FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT ISSUES</b>	
<b>Chapter 17 · Congressional Power to Enforce the Fourteenth Amendment</b>	<b>1041</b>
Note: The Enforcement Power before <i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i>	1041
<i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i>	1044

Note: <i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i> and Its Immediate Progeny	1056
<i>Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama v. Garrett</i>	1057
<i>Nevada Dept of Human Resources v. Hibbs</i>	1071
Note: The Role of Suspect Class Analysis in Congruence and Proportionality Review	1079
Note: The Enforcement Clause after <i>Garrett</i> and <i>Hibbs</i>	1079
Note: Enforcing the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Amendments	1082
Note: The State Action Requirement and the Enforcement Clause	1083
<b>Chapter 18 • The Problem of “State Action”</b>	<b>1087</b>
Note: The State Action Issue	1087
A. Government Functions	1089
<i>Marsh v. Alabama</i>	1089
Note: Shopping Centers as State Actors	1092
B. Government Entanglement	1093
Note: Radio Programs on Streetcars	1093
<i>Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority</i>	1094
Note: <i>Moose Lodge No. 107 v. Irvis</i>	1098
<i>Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.</i>	1100
Note: Government Authorization and Cooperation	1108
C. Judicial Enforcement and Legislative Authorization	1109
<i>Shelley v. Kraemer</i>	1109
<i>Reitman v. Mulkey</i>	1113
Note: Government Neutrality, Government Approval, and “State Action”	1122
D. State Action Today	1123
<i>Manhattan Community Access Corp. v. Halleck</i>	1123
Note: The State Action Analysis in <i>Manhattan Community Access</i>	1133
Note: The State Action Puzzle	1134
<b>Table of Cases</b>	<b>1135</b>
<b>Index</b>	<b>1145</b>





---

---

# Online Materials

---

---

Additional content for *Constitutional Law: Cases, Approaches, and Applications* (Third Edition) is available on Carolina Academic Press's Core Knowledge for Lawyers (CKL) website.

Core Knowledge for Lawyers is an online teaching and testing platform that hosts practice questions and additional content for both instructors and students.

To learn more, please visit:

[coreknowledgeforlawyers.com](http://coreknowledgeforlawyers.com)

Instructors may request complimentary access through the "Faculty & Instructors" link.



---

---

# About This Book

---

---

Constitutional Law is far too large a topic to be comprehensively covered in a book that aspires to be a reasonable size. (Indeed, it's all too large a topic to be covered in one law school class: you will also encounter foundational constitutional law issues in many classes, including, but not only, Criminal Procedure, Administrative Law, and Property.) The challenge of learning such a sprawling topic — even the limited parts of it covered in a standard Constitutional Law class — is only increased by the demands placed on law students today to learn not just legal doctrine, but skills. Quite literally, students in a modern constitutional law class have to learn not just what constitutional law is, but also how to practice it effectively.

This book attempts to meet these challenges in several ways. First, it focuses on the core “constitutional law” that is normally taught in a constitutional law survey class in most American law schools: constitutional structure (separation of powers and federalism) and Fourteenth Amendment rights (including the related issues of Congress's enforcement power and “state action”). Other topics, such as constitutional criminal procedure, procedural due process, the Takings Clause, and the First Amendment, are normally covered in other classes. Except as relevant to the topics it does cover, this book does not reproduce material that will be presented in books students will be asked to read (and purchase) for those classes.

Second, the content and structure of this book reflect its aim of teaching skills. A basic skill students need to learn is how to read a constitutional law opinion. In order to teach that skill, this book presents relatively fewer primary cases, but relatively longer excerpts of those cases. Those longer excerpts allow students to discern the structure of the Justices' constitutional law argumentation, rather than simply providing isolated snippets that present the black-letter rule without surrounding context. Cases and doctrinal progressions that aren't set forth in full-blown excerpts are presented in notes that provide the connective tissue between the primary cases.

Another basic skill is the use of precedent. This book is careful to retain excerpted cases' citations to cases previously presented in the book. The goal of including those citations is to allow students to refer back to those cited cases, and to reflect on how — and how well — the Court employs its own precedents.

The book's structure also reflects this focus on precedent, but also more generally on doctrinal approaches and methodologies. (Hence the “approaches” part of the

title.) For example, after Chapter 1's examination of the judicial power, Chapter 2 considers other aspects of the separation of national powers, rather than moving immediately to federalism, as many books do. This was not an arbitrary choice. Judicial power cases are separation of power cases; thus, Chapter 1's cases about the judicial power focus on the same concerns, adopt the same methodologies, and indeed, rely on the same cases, as Chapter 2's cases about the presidential-congressional relationship. Grouping these cases together, as Part I does, allows students to find connections between different doctrines and between precedents that, at first blush, deal with different issues.

Other parts of the book reflect this same philosophy. For example, Part III's examination of modern substantive due process analysis is not organized by the various topics covered (e.g., family structure, sexuality, and bodily autonomy). Instead, the cases are presented chronologically, thus allowing students to see how the Court at a given time understands and applies the due process precedents that came before.

Finally, the book's supplement aims to teach a skill that often goes unacknowledged in constitutional law books (and courses): the application of the constitutional law rules handed down by the Supreme Court. Often, books simply present the canonical Supreme Court cases on a given topic, and leave it at that. This approach often leaves students unsure what the rules announced in those cases really mean in practice. This result is unfortunate: most students' constitutional law practice will mainly consist of convincing lower courts to apply Supreme Court precedent in particular ways.

This book's supplement acknowledges this reality by providing appellate caselaw — usually quite recent caselaw — applying those rules. (Hence the “applications” part of the title.) That caselaw is presented in several forms: excerpts from opinions, notes, and, most frequently, problems based on cases. In addition to helping students learn how lower courts apply Supreme Court rules (and thus how to best frame legal arguments about such applications), these materials remind them that the constitutional “law” governing a particular case or entity emanates not just from the Supreme Court, but from the federal circuit or even the state courts where that case is filed or that entity is located. Of course, the supplement also plays the more traditional role of providing information about the Supreme Court's most recent cases.

---

---

# A Note on Editing

---

---

This book aspires to be a helpful and easy-to-use learning tool. That philosophy informs the editing conventions it employs.

Helping students understand how the Supreme Court uses precedent is an important aim of this book. Thus, it retains most citations to cases that appear earlier in the book. Citations to other cases are also sometimes retained, especially when the context would make it awkward or confusing to delete them or when the case appears later in a related context.

When an opinion or a note cites a case that has already appeared in the book, a *supra* cite is provided, but only the first time that opinion or note cites that earlier case. If the cited case has appeared as a full-blown excerpt, the citation will include only the year the case was decided and its chapter location. If the cited case has appeared only in a previous note, the later reference will also include the full U.S. Reports citation, to allow students to locate it more easily. If an opinion or note cites a case that appears later in the book, *infra* references are sometimes provided, especially if the later note or excerpt is relevant to the reason that case was cited at the earlier place. *Pin* cites (i.e., cites to particular pages in the Court's opinion) are generally omitted, except (again) where the context demands they be retained.

The book generally maintains the original paragraph breaks in the Court's opinions, but it sometimes deviates from them in order to promote readability (e.g., to avoid one-sentence or even one-line paragraphs, or a series of very short paragraphs). The book also deviates from the Court's opinions in that it deletes brackets that the Court has inserted around letters when changing tenses or the capitalization of letters or making other similar alterations to text it quotes. Thus, for example, if the Court's opinion reads as follows,

As we explained in Smith, “pass[ing] such a law raises serious constitutional concerns” that justify the scrutiny we perform today.

the excerpt in the book will read:

As we explained in Smith, “passing such a law raises serious constitutional concerns” that justify the scrutiny we perform today.

Further, internal quotation marks in an opinion will often be omitted unless, as with the example above, the internal quotation marks are integral to understanding the Court's sentence structure.

Ellipses can reflect the deletion of a word, phrase, sentence, or sometimes an entire paragraph or section. However, they are not used to reflect the deletion of citations or footnotes. Centered asterisks are used rather than ellipses only when ellipses are typographically inappropriate; there is no substantive significance to the book's use of ellipses rather than asterisks. (Note, however, that in rare cases, Justices will use centered asterisks to separate parts of an opinion. This book simply reprints those asterisks.) Footnotes retain their original numbering.

Note material has been edited to update outdated language. No such changes have been made to actual excerpts of opinions, with one exception: when an excerpted opinion refers to "intellectual disability" or "intellectually disabled persons" in brackets, the brackets reflect the author's deletion of outdated language for those concepts. See *Rosa's Law*, P.L. 111-256, 124 Stat. 2643 (similarly changing this language in federal statutes).

In short, readers can rely on this book for accurate transcriptions of the Court's language, but not for its paragraph structure, transformation of a quoted word (e.g., from capitalized to lower case), and use of internal quotations. Readers who wish to quote from the cases presented here for their own writing should consult the original versions of the cases.

---

---

# Introduction

---

---

Constitutional Law is fascinating and a crucial part of any American lawyer's knowledge. But it's also difficult. The issues themselves are highly complex, and that complexity is only multiplied by the vastness of the field, and the Justices' frequent disagreement about fundamental aspects of constitutional interpretation.

This brief Introduction can't even come close to comprehensively discussing these issues (let alone resolving them). Instead, it merely introduces students to the topic. The hope is that this Introduction will contextualize the materials that appear in this book and thus make them more comprehensible. In order to provide that context, this Introduction tackles several basic issues.

## 1. The Scope of the Material

Constitutional law is a vast topic. The Constitution is, simultaneously, a general blueprint for governmental structure, a guide for specific structural questions (e.g., how old does one have to be in order to become President?), and a charter of rights. Indeed, the topic is so broad that no one law school class aspires to cover all of constitutional law. Classes called "Constitutional Law" typically cover the materials this book addresses: the basics of federalism and the separation of powers (including the powers of the federal courts), due process, and equal protection. Even this enumeration overstates the coverage: for example, the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment has been understood to include, or "incorporate," as rights against state governments, most of the individual rights the Bill of Rights protects against federal impairment. But this book — like most Constitutional Law courses — does not cover those Bill of Rights provisions in detail. For example, while the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause incorporates the Fourth Amendment's guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures, you will not find a discussion of Fourth Amendment doctrine in this book, even though technically this right, in its incorporated form, is a "due process" right. For that discussion you'd need to take a class on criminal procedure.

But even the topics this book does cover comprise a vast array of issues. Does the federal government have the power to regulate water pollution? Can Congress control

how administrative agencies regulate? Can the President launch missile strikes on a foreign nation without a declaration of war? Can a state ban late-term abortions? Same-sex marriage? Can a state university engage in racial preferences? Can it regulate the lengths of trucks using its highways? The disparate nature of these topics, and others like them, presents a daunting challenge to students seeking a coherent understanding of the material covered in a basic Constitutional Law course. Finding themes in the Court's discussion of these topics will likely be one of your major tasks as you study this material. But one problem we can start to resolve is the one caused by the interrelationships between the different topics you'll consider. That interrelatedness creates a classic "chicken and egg" problem — that is, you can't understand topic A until you've learned about topic B, but you can't understand topic B until you've learned about topic A. In order to break out of this loop, the next part of this Introduction provides a very basic roadmap to the different areas the book covers, and notes places where an understanding of one topic will be useful to your comprehension of another.

## 2. An Overview of the Material

At a very basic level, this book covers the following topics, in the following order: the separation of powers (Part I); the federal-state relationship (Part II); substantive rights under the Due Process Clause (Part III); equality rights under the Equal Protection Clause (Part IV); and congressional power to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment and the problem of Fourteenth Amendment "state action" (both in Part V).

This book thus begins with structure, before moving on to rights. But don't think that structure and rights are hermetically sealed from each other. They are not. Indeed, the original drafters of the Constitution (the leaders who gathered in Philadelphia in 1787) inserted relatively few rights into the original document. Most of the rights we think about today when we think of "constitutional rights" — e.g., rights to free speech, or to be free of unreasonable searches or seizures or cruel and unusual punishment — were included as amendments to the Constitution, only after the Constitution's opponents insisted on those amendments as the price for their support of its ratification. But this is not to say the Framers did not care about rights. They cared deeply. However, for them, the real guarantee that the new federal government would not violate rights flowed from the structure the Constitution created — a system of limited federal power (as Part II examines), exercised through a structure which divided up even that limited power between three branches (as Part I examines). Thus, the structure you will study in the first half of the class was understood by the Framers to have concrete (and positive) implications for rights, by dividing power among competing institutions.

Your understanding of those structural materials will be assisted by realizing some basic facts. First, the federal government enjoys only those powers the Constitution



grants. In other words, it does not possess a general sovereignty to regulate whatever conduct it believes needs regulating — what is sometimes referred to as “the police power.” (Note that the “police power” extends far beyond what we think about as normal police department activities to include everything state and local governments typically regulate: for example, land-use, torts, and sanitation.) Nevertheless, the enumerated powers vested in the federal government cover a vast amount of regulatory ground. Much of that breadth comes from one particular federal power: Congress’s power, granted to it in Article I, to “regulate Commerce . . . among the several states.” Since the late 1930s, the interstate commerce power has come to be understood as granting Congress enormous power to regulate economic and social life. This has happened largely because the economy itself has become so nationally integrated that almost any conduct (say, a local sale of a loaf of bread) can be plausibly thought of as comprising part of a national (and even global) chain of activity. But that expansion has also come about because, over that period, the Supreme Court has become much more accepting of broad congressional use of the commerce power.

Obviously, these developments matter for purposes of the federalism materials you’ll study in Part II. But they also matter for Part I’s separation of powers discussion. The increased breadth of federal regulatory power has been accompanied by analogous growth in the federal regulatory apparatus — the alphabet soup of federal administrative agencies you may have heard of, from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and many others. Part I examines who controls that bureaucracy — the President (who, after all, has the power under Article II to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed”), or Congress, which enacted the legislation those agencies implement (and indeed, which created the agencies to begin with).

But the scope of federal power matters to the separation of powers for an additional reason. After all, it is the federal courts, and the Supreme Court in particular, that have come to be understood as the ultimate arbiters of the federal-state balance. As you’ll see in Part II, it was the Court that blocked much (though certainly not all) of the New Deal legislation expanding federal control over the economy starting in the 1930s. More recently, in the last thirty years, the Court has reinserted itself into the federalism equation, insisting on a key role in determining whether Congress has exceeded its Article I powers (in particular, but not only, its power over interstate commerce). Part I’s consideration of how the Court came to play such a critical role in determining what the Constitution means thus has major implications for how our federal system has evolved.

Just as the separation of powers materials in Part I presuppose some knowledge of the federalism materials in Part II, so too those federalism materials presuppose some knowledge of the individual rights materials in Parts III–V. The federalism and individual rights materials are related in part because another crucial congressional power is the power to enforce the Reconstruction Amendments (the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, so labeled because they were all part of the process by which the former confederate states were “reconstructed” after the Civil War). Those

amendments — especially the Fourteenth — impose significant limits on state conduct. Congress’s power to enforce those amendments also comes at the expense of state prerogatives; thus, that enforcement power has significant implications not just for the effective meaning of those constitutional rights but also for the federal-state balance. The enforcement power is discussed in Part V; the Fourteenth Amendment due process and equal protection rights Congress has the power to enforce are discussed, respectively, in Parts III and IV. Of course, those rights are also — indeed, primarily — enforced by the federal courts. Thus, Part I’s focus on the power of the federal courts remains relevant to the rest of the book.

Parts III and IV consider those Fourteenth Amendment rights. But even that straightforward statement requires clarification. Part III’s consideration of “substantive rights under the Due Process Clause” is not a complete examination of all such rights. As noted earlier, it does not examine particular Bill of Rights provisions (e.g., the Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable searches) that are included, or “incorporated,” within the “liberty” the Due Process Clause protects. (However, Part III does examine the incorporation process itself.) Instead, this book’s discussion of due process rights focuses mainly on “unenumerated” rights — the rights that are not textually provided in the Bill of Rights, but that the Court has found implicit in the idea of the “liberty” due process protects: rights to family relationships, privacy, sexual autonomy, and, for periods in our history, economic liberty and abortion.

As you’ll see when you read these materials, this book organizes the due process cases chronologically, to allow you to observe the evolution of the Court’s methodologies for identifying the existence of a due process right and deciding whether the challenged government action violates that right. The modern Court has been unable to coalesce around a single approach to due process issues. The book presents cases illustrating the varied and changing approaches the Justices have taken to those issues.

Part IV considers equality. Unlike due process, which applies explicitly to both the federal government (through the Fifth Amendment) and the states (through the Fourteenth), the guarantee of “the equal protection of the laws” applies explicitly only to the states, via the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause. However, as you’ll see in Part IV in a case called *Bolling v. Sharpe*, the Court has found an analogous equality guarantee to apply against the federal government, as part of the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause.

Beyond that wrinkle, one thing you may notice when you start to learn about equal protection is that, after an initial burst of concern with racial equality in the 1870s, the Court turned away from serious consideration of race for decades, and toward the meaning of “equal protection” in other contexts. As you think about the Court’s consideration of equal protection in those other contexts, consider the interpretive difficulty inherent in the phrase “the equal protection of the laws.” What does that guarantee require? What does it mean to treat persons equally? Can courts competently decide when treating two groups differently violates equal protection, or when,

instead, such differential treatment (for example, different tax rates for different types of income) is appropriate? Part IV considers these questions as applied to a variety of government classifications. Like the due process materials in Part III, the equal protection materials are presented in similarly roughly chronological manner.

Of course, eventually the Court (and the nation) returned to a serious consideration of racial equality, and has continued to debate that issue to the present day. The equal protection materials provide a detailed examination of that debate. This book presents the Court's treatment of race equality in two different ways. First, consistent with Part IV's roughly chronological approach, those materials note how the Court thought about race during earlier eras when it largely focused on other types of discrimination. Second, in Chapter 13, the book rewinds the historical tape and presents the Court's major statements on race from the pre-Civil War era to the modern day. This double exposure to the Court's race equality jurisprudence allows you to review the Court's thinking about race both in the context of the broader historical evolution of its thinking about equal protection and on its own terms.

Part V concludes the book by considering two issues that apply to both due process and equal protection. First, in Chapter 17, it examines the power noted earlier — Congress's power to "enforce" the Fourteenth Amendment. Those materials will require you to think about whether and, if so, when Congress may be better-placed than courts to decide what "due process" and "equal protection" mean. Thus, in addition to implicating federalism, the enforcement power also implicates the separation of power between Congress and the federal courts. Chapter 18 discusses the problem of state action — the requirement that parties alleging a violation of their Fourteenth Amendment rights point to some conduct by a state government. In most of the due process and equal protection cases you read in Parts III and IV, the "state action" is obvious. But Chapter 18 highlights situations where the issue is not as clear-cut.

### 3. The Unlitigated Constitution

This casebook devotes a not-insignificant number of pages to the constitutional views of persons and institutions other than courts (in particular, Congress, the president, and, to a lesser degree, important "cause" litigators who developed long-term litigation strategies designed to achieve broad constitutional change rather than simply specific results for their clients). Nevertheless, like the vast majority of constitutional law texts, this book focuses on courts, cases, and opinions. This focus necessarily obscures many parts of the Constitution — those that courts do not speak about, either because they feel incompetent or unauthorized to speak on those issues, or because they are so clear that nobody litigates them. These provisions comprise important pieces of our constitutional structure. It is worth spending a moment considering "the unlitigated constitution."

Start with the structure of our federal system. While many structural issues are litigated (as set forth in Parts I and II of the book), many others are so clear as to be settled simply as a matter of text. But they still raise important questions. For example, why is the Senate constructed the way it is? As of the 2020 census, the most populous state, California, had over 39 million people, while the least populous, Wyoming, had fewer than 600,000. Yet both states have two senators. To the extent state population disparities reflect socially-relevant differences (urban/rural, minority/white, affluent/poor, industrialized/agriculture or mining based), this structure locks in a bias toward certain interests. If nothing else, it locks in differences in voting power: a Californian or resident of some other high-population state can surely complain that her vote counts less — sometimes substantially less — than other Americans' when it comes to staffing the Senate. Such issues matter for the democratic character of our government.

Other structural features raise different concerns. For example, our system is set up so that the president does not have to be a member of the party that controls Congress. (Indeed, such “divided government” has become common in recent decades.) Other democracies are structured differently; for example, “parliamentary democracies” are structured so that the majority party in the legislature is, by definition, the party that controls the executive branch. (Thus, the British Prime Minister is always the leader of the party that controls the House of Commons.) As you'll see when you read the materials in Part I, Justices explain that the Framers “separated” national powers in order to discourage the tyranny that comes from concentrated power. But critics have noted a darker side to that separation: the paralysis and gridlock that many Americans routinely complain about today. That system is not subject to judicial challenge — it is clearly how our government is set up. But, like these other examples, it is nevertheless worth considering: after all, just because it's not litigated doesn't mean it's not “constitutional law.”

Finally, consider the “state action” limitation of the Fourteenth Amendment. As you'll see, judges, lawyers and scholars have proposed ways in which this limitation should not be as absolute as it might otherwise seem. But it unquestionably exists: in some basic way, the Fourteenth Amendment only acts as a limit on governmental (i.e., “state”) action. To what extent does this limitation crimp the Amendment's implicit promise that all Americans are equal, and that certain basic rights (to “life, liberty, and property”) cannot be impaired without “due process”? Does it matter that, today, corporations and other private institutions have power over individual Americans that was likely unimaginable when the Fourteenth Amendment was drafted? What does it matter if states are prevented from denying equal protection or free speech if private parties are free to do just that (at least in the absence of statutory regulation)? Again, the basic rule is unquestioned: the Fourteenth Amendment limits only states. What does that foregone choice by the Congress that drafted the Fourteenth Amendment mean for our conceptions of “equal protection” and “due process”?

## 4. Methods of Constitutional Interpretation

A final concept you should be aware of as you begin your study of constitutional law is the modern debate over the proper method(s) of interpreting the Constitution. In recent decades, scholars have heatedly debated the legitimacy of various interpretive methodologies. Those debates are not merely academic: judges and Justices have entered them as well, and you'll see those debates reflected in the judicial opinions you read.

The first methodological debate you'll encounter, in Part I, is between those who view the separation of powers as calling for bright-line rules demarcating the prerogatives of the three branches, and those who apply more fact-specific, functional tests. Both of these approaches can claim a foundation in fundamental separation of powers principles: the Constitution unquestionably separates the federal legislative, executive, and judicial powers, but it also calls for branches to share powers, for example, when Article II makes the President Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces but gives Congress the power to declare war and provide those forces. These countervailing principles have led to a separation of powers jurisprudence that oscillates uneasily between these two approaches.

An even more fundamental interpretive faultline is the one over "originalism." This is an interpretive methodology that, as understood today, seeks to find constitutional meaning in the original meaning of the words used in the Constitution. (Earlier versions of originalism focused on the original intentions of those who drafted and/or ratified the Constitution, or the original expectations about how a provision would be applied; however, these approaches have faded somewhat in favor of so-called "original meaning originalism.") The insight underlying originalism is straightforward: the Constitution is comprised of words, and the standard way lawyers interpret a legal document is to inquire into what the relevant words meant when they were used in that document. Indeed, the argument goes further, and observes that the Constitution is legitimate law only because it was ratified by the American people. But what those people ratified were the words, with the meanings those words had to those people. Thus, the argument goes, the only legitimate way to give force to the Constitution as legally binding is to give effect to the original meaning of its words.

This is a powerful argument. But it encounters the response that the Constitution, as a short and often non-specific document, cannot always sensibly be interpreted solely by recourse to its "original public meaning." As a practical matter, such meaning may be difficult to uncover, given the passage of time. It may also be difficult for more fundamental reasons as well. For example, one might wonder whether someone today can discern the original public meaning of a word or a term when the surrounding context has changed dramatically. Consider one example. One might, with effort, be able to determine what the average American thought "interstate commerce" meant

in 1787. But that meaning might be inextricably enmeshed in a set of understandings about the world — e.g., understandings about how much interstate trade there was in 1787, and how much commerce was in fact truly local, in the sense that commerce in isolated communities had essentially no impact on commerce across state lines. Did the meaning of “interstate commerce” — not just its application, but its actual meaning — change when the economy integrated as much as it did after the Industrial Revolution? Finally, and perhaps most fundamentally, one single “meaning” of a constitutional term may simply not exist. The Constitution was a compromise; it is likely the Framers left some provisions vague simply because there was no consensus about what they should say.

A prominent competitor to originalism is so-called “living constitutionalism.” Speaking very generally, this theory posits that constitutional meaning should evolve over time, in response to the nation’s political, economic, and social evolution. Consider, for example, the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause. In 1868, it was highly unlikely that most Americans understood “equal protection” to require sex equality. (Early women’s rights advocates did push for such a meaning, but they were a distinct minority.) When today we believe that “equal protection” includes sex equality, are we engaging in living constitutionalism? Some originalists argue that sex equality is simply an application of the Clause’s original meaning, which, they say, was to abolish all arbitrary classifications. Of course, if all originalist analysis can do is posit a meaning at a very high level of generality (e.g., “the original meaning of equal protection is to prohibit all arbitrary classifications”), then all the hard work is being done at the level of applying that meaning to concrete situations. Thus, a living constitutionalist might accept originalism, but argue that originalist analysis does very little to decide cases without some other interpretive tool filling in what originalism leaves undecided. And, indeed, some prominent originalists essentially agree with this critique, at least in certain cases. Another competitor to originalism posits that the Court should understand the Constitution against the backdrop of the democratic structure the Framers created. As you’ll see, at particular times and in particular doctrinal areas, a “political process” approach to constitutional interpretation has been influential.

As you read this book, think about these methodological disputes. While they may seem far removed from the nuts-and-bolts questions the cases answer, understanding these debates will help you uncover connections between the cases.

## 5. Setting the Scene: The Constitutional System in 1787

English colonization of the North American continent had existed for over 150 years when the thirteen colonies declared their independence in 1776. Those colonies featured governments that would be roughly recognizable today, consisting



of colonial legislatures, some type of court system, and an executive, often appointed from London.

The immediate post-independence period featured changes to those colonial governments, the implications of which influenced the Framers a decade later. After independence, the colonies reorganized themselves as states. They ejected royal governors, and while most of them instituted an office of “governor,” those positions often wielded much less authority than their colonial-era forebearers, with popularly-elected legislators taking on greater power.

The results of these changes worried many of the leaders who gathered in Philadelphia in 1787. They expressed concern that those newly-empowered legislatures, freed from any significant check from other branches, had infringed on property and contract rights, for example, by printing currency in amounts that effectively diminished the value of debts and even overturning court judgments on debts. (Justice Scalia discusses this phenomenon in *Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm*, excerpted in Chapter 1.) Echoes of these concerns can be heard in the Constitution’s restrictions on states coining money, “making any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts,” and “passing any . . . Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts.” Art. I, § 10, cl. 1. More generally, the experience of living under all-powerful, unchecked legislative bodies convinced many Framers of the importance of dividing sovereign power, in order to guard against tyranny.

At the same time, the nation’s experience under the Articles of Confederation convinced many Americans of the need for a stronger central government. The Articles, under which the nation was formally governed from the latter stages of the Revolution until the Constitution’s ratification, essentially created a league, or community, of sovereign nations. While the Articles government had the authority to act abroad, it had very little sovereign coercive authority domestically: for example, it relied on states for its tax revenue and lacked the power to regulate commerce between the states. As a consequence, the national government was unable to act vigorously to promote economic growth and prevent trade wars between the states. Indeed, the Articles government could, for the most part, act only on the states rather than directly regulating the American people, further enfeebling the central government.

These weaknesses ultimately led political leaders to push for a convention to strengthen the central government. That movement culminated in the Philadelphia convention (officially convened merely to consider amendments to the Articles), where delegates from the states reached compromises that resulted in a charter for an entirely new government — the Constitution. When the Constitution was sent to the states for ratification, opponents of the Constitution, known as the anti-Federalists, objected that the proposed federal government would be so strong that it would threaten Americans’ liberties. In response, the Constitution’s proponents argued that that risk was reduced both by the limited powers the document gave to the federal government and the internal separations it created between the three federal branches. Nevertheless, they promised to amend the Constitution to provide a set of explicit guarantees — what became the Bill of Rights.

The ratification fight in New York produced a particularly noteworthy set of arguments. Prominent proponents of the Constitution — Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay — wrote a series of essays urging ratification. Those essays, which were printed in the local press, were eventually published as *The Federalist Papers*. Throughout Parts I and II you'll see references to those essays, which are considered important insights into the Constitution's meaning.

# The Constitution of the United States of America

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

## Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.



When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.

No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall chuse their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel

the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States: If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by Yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect,

shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of Particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State

in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; — And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Section 9. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing it's [sic] inspection Laws: and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Controul of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

## Article II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same Term, be elected, as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately chuse by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner chuse the President. But in chusing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representatives from each State having one Vote; a quorum for this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall chuse from them by Ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the Time of chusing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be encreased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation: — “I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to Grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

## Article III

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall

hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority; — to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and Consuls; — to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; — to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party; — to Controversies between two or more States; — between a State and Citizens of another State; — between Citizens of different States; — between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.

## Article IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.



No Person held to Service or Labour in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

## Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

## Article VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any state to the Contrary notwithstanding.



The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

## **Article VII**

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same.

### **Amendment 1 [1791]**

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.

### **Amendment 2 [1791]**

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

### **Amendment 3 [1791]**

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

### **Amendment 4 [1791]**

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

### **Amendment 5 [1791]**

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger;

nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

### **Amendment 6 [1791]**

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

### **Amendment 7 [1791]**

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

### **Amendment 8 [1791]**

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

### **Amendment 9 [1791]**

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

### **Amendment 10 [1791]**

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

### **Amendment 11 [1795]**

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

## Amendment 12 [1804]

The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; — The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted; — The person having the greatest Number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President — The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

## Amendment 13 [1865]

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

## Amendment 14 [1868]

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or

immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

## **Amendment 15 [1870]**

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

## **Amendment 16 [1913]**

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

## **Amendment 17 [1913]**

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

## **Amendment 18 [1919]**

Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

## **Amendment 19 [1920]**

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

## **Amendment 20 [1933]**

Section 1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

Section 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Section 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Section 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

Section 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

Section 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.

## **Amendment 21 [1933]**

Section 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

Section 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

## **Amendment 22 [1951]**

Section 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be

elected to the office of the President more than once. But this Article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President, when this Article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

## **Amendment 23 [1961]**

Section 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct: A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

## **Amendment 24 [1964]**

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

## **Amendment 25 [1967]**

Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.

## **Amendment 26 [1971]**

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

## **Amendment 27 [1992]**

No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.



---

---

# Table of Cases

---

---

- A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 166, 172, 178, 343
- Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner, 105, 108
- Adair v. United States, 349
- Adams v. Tanner, 565
- Adamson v. California, 576
- Adarand v. Pena, 931
- Adkins v. Children's Hospital, 551, 559, 565, 569, 593, 616, 769
- Akins v. Texas, 767, 961
- Alabama v. King & Boozer, 522
- Alden v. Maine, 478, 513
- Allegheny Pittsburgh Coal Co. v. Commission of Webster County, 759
- Allen v. Cooper, 512
- Allgeyer v. Louisiana, 543, 544, 554, 569, 586, 668, 890
- Allied Stores of Ohio, Inc. v. Bowers, 885, 993
- Already, LLC v. Nike, Inc., 118
- Altria Group v. Good, 447
- Amalgamated Food Employees Union v. Logan Valley Plaza, Inc., 1092
- Ambach v. Norwick, 828, 991
- American Federation of Labor v. Swing, 1112
- American Ins. Ass'n v. Garamendi, 265
- American Power & Light Co. v. SEC, 167
- American Textile Manufacturers Institute v. Donovan, 172
- Anderson v. United States, 318
- Apodaca v. Oregon, 584
- Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Dev. Corp., 971
- Arlington Heights, Village of, v. Metropolitan Housing Dev. Corp., 78
- Armour v. City of Indianapolis, 760
- ASARCO Inc. v. Kadish, 67
- Associated General Contractors of Cal. v. City and Cty. of San Francisco, 928
- Austin v. New Hampshire, 426
- Autolite Corp. v. Midwesco Enterprises, 418
- Bain Peanut Co. of Tex. v. Pinson, 45
- Baker v. Carr, 47
- Baker v. Nelson, 693, 699
- Baldwin v. Fish and Game Comm'n of Montana, 425, 426
- Baldwin v. G.A.F. Seelig, Inc., 380
- Barbier v. Connolly, 543, 735
- Barron v. Baltimore, 572, 577
- Barrows v. Jackson, 83
- Belle Terre, Village of, v. Boraas, 635
- Bibb v. Navajo Freight Lines, Inc., 392, 401, 412
- Blum v. Yaretsky, 1124
- Blyew v. United States, 852
- Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public Schools v. Dowell, 879
- Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth, 654
- Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama v. Garrett, 1057

- Boddie v. Connecticut, 1080  
 Boerne, City of, v. Flores, 1043, 1044  
 Bolling v. Sharpe, 870  
 Borden's Farm Products Co., Inc. v. Ten Eyck, 736  
 Boumediene v. Bush, 260  
 Bowers v. Hardwick, 651, 676, 679, 697, 1006, 1012  
 Bowsher v. Synar, 205, 211, 221, 238  
 Boy Scouts of America v. Dale, 690  
 Bradwell v. Illinois, 769, 772, 996  
 Brig Aurora, 166, 183  
 Brown v. Board of Education, 18, 19, 467, 768, 811, 867, 873, 900  
 Buchanan v. Warley, 19, 871  
 Buck v. Bell, 570, 598, 899, 1062  
 Buckley v. Valeo, 208  
 Bunting v. Oregon, 551, 560  
 Burbank, City of, v. Lockheed Air Terminal, 447  
 Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority, 882, 1094  
 Bush v. Gore, 21, 1034  
 Butler, United States v., 459, 517, 520, 524  
 C.A. Carbone, Inc. v. City of Clarkstown, N.Y., 394  
 Caban v. Mohammed, 649, 657  
 Cabell v. Chavez-Salido, 828  
 Califano v. Westcott, 787  
 Cammer v. United States, 828  
 Camps Newfound/Owatonna, Inc. v. Town of Harrison, Me., 421  
 Carey v. Population Services Int'l, 680  
 Carolene Products Co., United States v., 730, 745, 763, 799, 823, 824, 838  
 Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 320, 324, 332, 343, 1070  
 Central Va. Comm. College v. Katz, 449, 512  
 Chafin v. Chafin, 118  
 Champion v. Ames, 329  
 Chialfalo v. Washington, 159  
 Chicago Board of Trade v. Olsen, 331  
 Chicago, Burlington & Quincy RR v. City of Chicago, 572  
 Chisholm v. Georgia, 478, 479, 486, 506  
 Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. Hialeah, 87, 92  
 Cipollone v. Liggett Group, 446  
 City of (See Name of City)  
 Civil Rights Cases, 853, 909, 1005, 1042, 1050, 1082, 1087, 1095, 1098, 1100, 1111  
 Clark v. Jeter, 819  
 Cleburne, City of, v. Cleburne Living Center, 982, 1079  
 Clinton v. Jones, 143, 149  
 Cohens v. Virginia, 278  
 Colegrove v. Green, 48  
 Coleman v. Court of Appeals, 1081, 1083  
 Coleman v. Miller, 49  
 Coleman v. Thompson, 468  
 Collector v. Day, 521  
 College Savings Bank v. Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Ed. Expense Bd., 1072  
 Commodities Futures Trading Corp. v. Schor, 30, 237  
 Commonwealth of (See Name of Commonwealth)  
 Comstock, United States v., 303, 374  
 Cooley v. Board of Wardens, 348, 378, 386, 421, 422  
 Cooper v. Aaron, 19, 467, 877  
 Coppage v. Kansas, 565  
 County of (See Name of County)  
 Craig v. Boren, 776  
 Cruikshank, United States v., 744  
 Cruzan v. Director, Mo. Dept. of Health, 659  
 Curtiss-Wright Export Corp., United States v., 241, 246, 261  
 Dames & Moore v. Regan, 242  
 Dandridge v. Williams, 750, 834  
 Darby, United States v., 328, 452

- Davis v. Beason, 1004  
De Jonge v. Oregon, 764  
Dean Milk Co. v. Madison, 381  
DeFunis v. Odegaard, 113, 887  
Department of Agriculture v. Moreno, 981, 987, 1005, 1013, 1068  
Department of Revenue of Kentucky v. Davis, 393, 416  
Department of State v. Munoz, 726  
Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, 609  
Doe v. Bolton, 83  
Dred Scott v. Sandford, 18, 39, 532, 668, 707, 845  
Dunn v. Blumstein, 428  
Dourousseau v. United States, 25  
E.C. Knight Co., United States v., 312  
Edelman v. Jordan, 479  
Eisenstadt v. Baird, 594, 596, 613, 640, 652, 660, 680, 698, 721, 1013  
Employees v. Missouri Public Health Dept., 491  
Employment Division v. Smith, 1043, 1045  
Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co., 635  
Evans v. Abney, 1100, 1101  
Evans v. Newton, 1102, 1104, 1121, 1125  
Ex parte (See Name of Relator)  
Exxon v. Governor of Maryland, 410, 412  
F.S. Royster Guano Co. v. Virginia, 1003  
Farrington v. Tokushige, 570  
Fay v. New York, 767  
FCC v. Beach Communications, Inc., 1069  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission v. Mississippi, 454, 460  
Ferguson v. Skrupa, 564  
Ferry Co. v. Pennsylvania, 316  
Fiallo v. Bell, 806  
Field v. Clark, 166  
Fisher v. University of Texas, 934, 943  
Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer, 497  
Fleming v. Page, 265  
Flemming v. Nestor, 750  
Fletcher v. Peck, 668, 965  
Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Exp. Bd v. College Savings Bank, 511, 1056  
Foley v. Connelie, 828, 991  
Ford Motor Co. v. Department of Treasury, 480, 483, 487, 498  
Fort Gratiot Sanitary Landfill, Inc. v. Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources, 399  
Foster-Fountain Packing Co. v. Haydel, 396  
Franks v. Bowman Transportation Co., 893  
Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, 217  
Freeman v. Hewit, 421  
Freeman v. Pitts, 879  
Freytag v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 239  
Friends of the Earth v. Laidlaw Environmental Services, 101  
Frontiero v. Richardson, 770  
FTC v. Ruberoid Co., 226  
Fullilove v. Klutznick, 912, 916, 925, 1051  
Gade v. National Solid Wastes Management Association, 436  
Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority, 406, 452, 458, 511  
Garland, Ex parte, 829  
Gayle v. Browder, 881  
Gibbons v. Ogden, 306, 452  
Glon v. American Guaranty & Liability Ins. Co., 809, 813  
Goesaert v. Cleary, 770, 799, 804  
Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar, 428  
Gomez v. Perez, 820  
Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 964, 965, 969  
Gong Lum v. Rice, 859  
Gonzales v. Raich, 359

- Gonzalez v. Carhart, 608  
 Goodridge v. Department of Public Health, 693  
 Graham v. Richardson, 822, 823, 831, 889  
 Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. v. Cottrell, 414  
 Green v. School Board of New Kent County, Virginia, 878, 902  
 Gregg v. Georgia, 972  
 Griffin v. Illinois, 833, 1032  
 Griffin v. School Board, 484  
 Griffiths, In re, 428, 825, 828, 991  
 Grimaud, United States v., 166  
 Griswold v. Connecticut, 83, 584, 587  
 Grutter v. Bollinger, 933, 939  
 Guest, United States v., 1050, 1084  
 Gundy v. United States, 174  
 H.P. Hood & Sons, Inc. v. Du Mond, 398  
 Haig v. Agee, 265  
 Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, 259  
 Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 257  
 Hamilton v. Kentucky Distilleries & W. Co., 49  
 Hammer v. Dagenhart, 319, 330, 353  
 Hans v. Louisiana, 478, 480, 487, 499, 500, 503, 1059, 1072  
 Hardin v. Kentucky Utilities Co., 72  
 Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 143  
 Harper v. Virginia Bd. of Elections, 820, 833  
 Hauenstein v. Lynham, 826  
 Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman, 86, 96  
 Hayburn's Case, 38, 45, 62  
 Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States, 338, 344, 1042, 1050  
 Heller v. Doe, 1060  
 Helvering v. Gerhardt, 522  
 Hennen, Ex parte, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225  
 Hernandez v. Texas, 890  
 Hicklin v. Orbeck, 427  
 Hirabayashi v. United States, 889  
 Hodel v. Virginia Surface Mining & Reclamation Assn., Inc., 344, 369, 454  
 Holden v. Hardy, 545, 560, 586  
 Hollingsworth v. Perry, 694  
 Holmes v. City of Atlanta, 881  
 Houston, E. & W. Tex. Ry. Co. v. United States, 319, 331, 336, 343  
 Hoyt v. Florida, 770, 799, 804  
 Hudgens v. NLRB, 1093, 1126  
 Hughes v. Alexandria Scrap, 415  
 Humphrey's Executor v. United States, 196, 203, 212, 220  
 Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advertising Commission, 409  
 Hunter v. Underwood, 972  
 Idaho v. Coeur d'Alene Tribe, 496  
 In re (See Name of Matter or Party)  
 In re Marriage of (See Name of Spouses)  
 Industrial Union, AFL- CIO v. American Petroleum Institute, 172, 188, 189  
 Ingraham v. Wright, 655  
 INS v. Chadha, 43, 95, 135, 190  
 J.E.B. v. Alabama ex rel. T.B., 790  
 J.W. Hampton, Jr. & Co. v. United States, 166, 176  
 Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co., 1098, 1100  
 Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 548, 550, 571, 598  
 James B. Beam Distilling Co. v. Georgia, 37  
 James v. Strange, 750  
 Japan Whaling Assn. v. American Cetacean Society, 76  
 Jefferson v. Hackney, 750  
 Johnson v. Haydel, 396  
 Johnson v. Robison, 750, 754  
 Johnson v. Virginia, 883  
 Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co., 1082  
 June Medical Services v. Russo, 609  
 Kahn v. Shevin, 775, 777, 901

- Katzenbach v. McClung, 338, 344, 459, 527, 1042  
Katzenbach v. Morgan, 930, 1043, 1047, 1067, 1072  
Keyes v. School District Number 1, 878  
Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 895  
Kidd v. Pearson, 310, 314, 324, 331, 335, 342  
Kimel v. Board of Regents, 1057, 1058  
Kitchen v. Herbert, 704, 705  
Klein, United States v., 27, 38, 148, 164  
Knoxville Iron Co. v. Harbison, 560  
Korematsu v. United States, 766, 861  
Kovacs v. Cooper, 827  
Labine v. Vincent, 814  
Lalli v. Lalli, 991  
Lampf, Pleva, Lipkind, Prupis & Petigrow v. Gilbertson, 37  
Lane County v. Oregon, 458  
Larson v. Domestic & Foreign Commerce Corp., 490  
Lassiter v. Northampton County Board of Elections, 1043, 1047  
Lawrence v. Texas, 676, 678  
Lehr v. Robertson, 649, 650, 657  
Leis v. Flynt, 432  
Levy v. Louisiana, 809  
License Cases, 536  
Linda R.S. v. Richard D., 72  
Lindsley v. Natural Carbonic Gas Co., 815  
Lloyd Corp. v. Tanner, 1092  
Lochner v. New York, 354, 544  
Lombard v. Louisiana, 1116  
Lopez, United States v., 342  
Los Angeles & Salt Lake R. Co., United States v., 112  
Los Angeles v. Lyons, 81  
Lottery Case, 329  
Louisville Gas & Elec. Co. v. Coleman, 1004  
Lovell v. Griffin, 1090  
Loving v. United States, 185, 265  
Loving v. Virginia, 660, 699, 820, 884  
Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co., 1125  
Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 65, 66  
Luther v. Borden, 51  
M.L.B. v. S.L.J., 1035  
Mackenzie v. Hare, 804  
Maine v. Taylor, 397, 413  
Manhattan Community Access Corp. v. Halleck, 1123  
Marbury v. Madison, 6  
Marsh v. Alabama, 1089  
Martin v. Hunter's Lessee, 274  
Martin v. Mott, 49  
Maryland v. Wirtz, 450, 460  
Massachusetts Board of Retirement v. Murgia, 750, 837  
Massachusetts v. EPA, 103  
Massachusetts v. Feeney, 991, 1003  
Mathews v. Diaz, 831  
Mathews v. Lucas, 812  
Mayflower Farms, Inc. v. Ten Eyck, 740  
Maynard v. Hill, 1027  
Mayor and City Council of Baltimore v. Dawson, 881  
McCabe v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe RR, 859, 1116  
McCardle, Ex parte, 24  
McCleskey v. Kemp, 969  
McCulloch v. Maryland, 127, 228, 229, 279, 295  
McDonald v. City of Chicago, 582, 714  
McGowan v. Maryland, 782  
McGrain v. Daugherty, 146  
McLaughlin v. State of Florida, 885, 984  
McLaurin v. Oklahoma, 860, 938  
Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC, 930, 931  
Meyer v. Nebraska, 567  
Michael H. v. Gerald D., 646  
Michael M. v. Superior Court, 786, 997  
Miller v. Albright, 806  
Milliken v. Bradley, 879  
Mills v. Habluetzel, 820

- Minersville School Dist. v. Gobitis, 616, 765
- Minnesota v. Barber, 396
- Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan, 787, 790, 804, 820
- Mississippi v. Johnson, 136
- Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada, 859
- Missouri v. Jenkins, 879
- Mistretta v. United States, 172, 176, 238
- Mobile, County of, v. Kimball, 311
- Monaco v. Mississippi, 492, 506
- Mondou v. New York, N. H. & H. R. Co., 474
- Moore v. City of East Cleveland, 634
- Moose Lodge No. 107 v. Irvis, 1098, 1100
- Morehead v. New York ex rel. Tipaldo, 558
- Morey v. Doud, 750
- Morrison v. Olson, 206
- Morrison, United States v., 358, 361, 529, 1084
- Muir v. Louisville Park Theatrical Association, 881
- Muller v. Oregon, 551, 561
- Munn v. Illinois, 535
- Murdock v. Memphis, 287
- Murphy v. National Collegiate Athletic Association, 476
- Murphy v. Ramsey, 1011
- Murray's Lessee v. Hoboken Land & Improvement Co., 31
- Muskraat v. United States, 62
- Myers v. United States, 148, 193, 203, 211, 237
- NAACP v. State of Alabama, 588
- Naim v. Naim, 880, 884
- National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 167
- National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, 304, 373, 517, 528
- National Ins. Co. v. Tidewater Co., 654
- National League of Cities v. Usery, 449, 451, 460
- National Pork Producers Council v. Ross, 411, 420
- Near v. Minnesota, 764
- Nebbia v. New York, 552
- Nevada Dept. of Human Resources v. Hibbs, 805, 1071
- New Energy Co. of Ind. v. Limbach, 398, 414
- New Jersey Welfare Rights Org. v. Cahill, 813
- New Orleans City Park Improvement Association v. Detiege, 881
- New Orleans v. Dukes, 750
- New York Central Securities Corp. v. United States, 178
- New York v. United States, 456
- New York, Ex parte, 487
- Nguyen v. INS, 801, 806
- Nixon v. Administrator of General Services, 43, 142, 159
- Nixon v. Condon, 1102, 1116
- Nixon v. Fitzgerald, 143, 147
- Nixon v. Herndon, 764
- Nixon v. United States, 55
- Nixon, United States v., 137
- NLRB v. Fainblatt, 331, 337
- NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., 322
- Nordic Village, Inc., United States v., 402
- Nordlinger v. Hahn, 759, 1013
- Northeastern Fla. Ch. of the Assoc. Gen. Contrs. of Am. v. Jacksonville, 80
- Northern Pipeline Constr. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 32
- Norton v. Weinberger, 816
- Obergefell v. Hodges, 695, 804
- Ohio ex rel. Clarke v. Deckebach, 826
- Oregon v. Mitchell, 889, 1047, 1069
- Orr v. Orr, 787
- Pace v. Alabama, 859
- Palko v. Connecticut, 573
- Palmore v. Sidoti, 988

- Panama Refining v. Ryan, 167, 172, 178  
 Paradise, United States v., 912  
 Parents Involved in Community Schools  
     v. Seattle School District No.1,  
     872, 935, 979  
 Pasadena City Board of Education v.  
     Spangler, 879  
 Passenger Cases, 421  
 Patson v. Pennsylvania, 826  
 Paul v. United States, 190  
 Paul v. Virginia, 425  
 Pennhurst State School & Hospital v.  
     Halderman, 485  
 Pennsylvania v. Union Gas, 499, 504  
 Perez v. Campbell, 440  
 Perez v. United States, 339, 344, 458  
 Perkins v. Smith, 828  
 Perkins, United States v., 220  
 Personnel Administrator of  
     Massachusetts v. Feeney, 966, 972  
 Peterson v. City of Greenville, 1116  
 Philadelphia v. New Jersey, 396  
 Pickett v. Brown, 821  
 Pierce v. Society of Sisters,  
     570, 591, 597, 613,  
     635, 648, 660, 679, 700, 721, 764  
 Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc., 393, 395, 420  
 Pink, United States v., 244  
 Planned Parenthood of Missouri v.  
     Danforth, 85  
 Planned Parenthood of SE Pa. v. Casey,  
     604, 605, 609, 720  
 Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, 37  
 Pleasant Grove City v. Summum, 87, 92  
 Plessy v. Ferguson, 744, 853  
 Plyler v. Doe, 830, 984, 997  
 Poe v. Ullman, 590, 626,  
     635, 652, 698, 723  
 Porterfield v. Webb, 826  
 Powell v. Alabama, 590  
 Powell v. McCormack, 55, 58, 138, 284  
 Prigg v. Pennsylvania, 844  
 Prince v. Massachusetts, 597  
 Printz v. United States, 473  
 Prize Cases, 249, 250  
 Public Utilities Commission v. Pollak,  
     1093, 1101  
 Puerto Rico v. Branstad, 467, 472  
 Puerto Rico, Commonwealth of, v.  
     Franklin California Tax-free Trust,  
     447  
 Quilloin v. Walcott, 649, 657  
 Railway Express Agency v. New York,  
     563, 564, 746  
 Ramos v. Louisiana, 584  
 Rasul v. Bush, 259  
 Reed v. Reed, 603,  
     770, 771, 776, 815, 840,  
     991, 1031, 1073  
 Reese, United States v., 1082  
 Regents of the University of California v.  
     Bakke, 888  
 Reitman v. Mulkey, 1113  
 Reno v. Condon, 473  
 Reno v. Flores, 661  
 Reynolds v. United States, 175  
 Richardson v. Davis, 813  
 Richardson, United States v., 71  
 Richmond, City of, v. J.A. Croson Co.,  
     913  
 Robbins v. Shelby County Taxing Dist.,  
     422  
 Robel, United States v., 173  
 Roberts v. City of Boston, 854  
 Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens  
     Council, 76  
 Robertson v. Seattle Audubon Society,  
     35, 38  
 Robinson v. State of Florida, 1116  
 Rochin v. California, 582, 591, 613,  
     660, 722  
 Roe v. Wade, 22, 595  
 Rome, City of, v. United States, 1047  
 Romer v. Evans, 678, 684, 697, 999  
 Rosado v. Wyman, 483  
 Rostker v. Goldberg, 785, 997  
 Rothstein v. Wyman, 481  
 Royster Guano Co. v. Virginia, 780



- Sacramento, County of, v. Lewis, 683  
 Saenz v. Roe, 1035  
 San Antonio Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Rodriguez, 834, 837, 878, 889, 994, 1033  
 Sanchez, United States v., 520  
 Schlesinger v. Ballard, 775, 777, 815, 901  
 Schlesinger v. Reservists Comm. to Stop the War, 71  
 SEC v. Jarkesy, 33  
 Second Employers' Liability Cases, N.H. & H.R. Co., 466, 474  
 Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 164, 219  
 Seminole Tribe v. Florida, 449, 494, 501  
 Sessions v. Morales-Santana, 802  
 Shapiro v. Thompson, 1035  
 Sharpnack, United States v., 173  
 Sharyne and Stephen B., In re Marriage of, 655  
 Shelby County v. Holder, 1083  
 Shelley v. Kraemer, 1088, 1109  
 Sherbert v. Verner, 1045  
 Shreveport Rate Cases, 319, 331, 336, 343  
 Simon v. E. Ky. Welfare Rights Org., 67, 79, 93  
 Singleton v. Wulff, 65, 82  
 Sipuel v. Board of Regents, 859, 860  
 Skinner v. Mid-America Pipeline Co., 185  
 Skinner v. Oklahoma, 571, 586, 591, 597, 613, 635, 656, 660, 702, 721, 884, 889, 984, 994, 1004, 1027  
 Slaughter-House Cases, 533, 572, 577, 744, 852, 944  
 Snyder v. Massachusetts, 575, 649  
 Sonzinsky v. United States, 330, 518  
 South Carolina State Highway Department v. Barnwell Bros., 385  
 South Carolina v. Baker, 522  
 South Carolina v. Katzenbach, 472, 1047, 1064, 1082  
 South Carolina v. United States, 521  
 South-Central Timber Development, Inc. v. Wunnicke, 397, 416  
 South Dakota v. Dole, 523  
 Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona, 388  
 Southern Pacific Terminal Company v. ICC, 117  
 Spokeo, LLC v. Robins, 87, 92  
 Springer v. Philippine Islands, 44  
 Sproles v. Binford, 393  
 Stanley v. Illinois, 649, 653, 655, 657  
 Stenberg v. Carhart, 608  
 Stern v. Marshall, 32, 226, 237  
 Strauder v. West Virginia, 744, 853, 890  
 Stromberg v. California, 764  
 Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College, 936, 937  
 Sugarman v. Dougall, 823, 825  
 Supreme Court of New Hampshire v. Piper, 425  
 Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 878, 902  
 Sweatt v. Painter, 768, 795, 860, 869, 1004  
 Swift & Co. v. United States, 318  
 Takahashi v. Fish and Game Comm'n, 822, 824  
 Tennessee v. Lane, 1080  
 Terrace v. Thompson, 826  
 Terry v. Adams, 1102, 1125  
 Testa v. Katt, 466, 472, 473, 474, 475  
 Tigner v. Texas, 102  
 Timbs v. Indiana, 583  
 Toilet Goods Association v. Gardner, 111  
 Toomer v. Witsell, 396, 404, 427  
 Trafficante v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 72  
 TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez, 89  
 Trichell v. Midland Credit Mgmt., Inc., 93  
 Trimble v. Gordon, 830, 991  
 Truax v. Corrigan, 734



- Truax v. Raich, 822, 823, 890  
 Trump v. Anderson, 1042  
 Trump v. Hawaii, 866  
 Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP, 144, 149  
 Trump v. United States, 147  
 Trump v. Vance, 144  
 Turner v. City of Memphis, 882  
 Turner v. Safley, 613, 699, 721  
 Twining v. New Jersey, 573, 577  
 U.S. Dept. of Agriculture v. Moreno, 750  
 U.S. Dept. of Agriculture v. Murry, 750  
 U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton, 283  
 Union Pacific R. Co. v. Botsford, 597, 723  
 United Building & Construction Trades Council v. Mayor & Council of Camden, 432  
 United Haulers Ass'n, Inc. v. Oneida-Herkimer Solid Waste Mgm't Auth., 415, 416  
 United Public Workers v. Mitchell, 106  
 United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz, 748  
 United States v. (See Name of Defendant)  
 Vance v. Bradley, 752  
 Veazie v. Moor, 335  
 Verizon Maryland, Inc. v. Pub. Svc. Comm'n of Maryland, 496  
 Village of (See Name of Village)  
 Virginia, Ex parte, 853, 929, 1047  
 Virginia, United States v., 788  
 Vitek v. Jones, 655  
 Ward v. Maryland, 427  
 Warth v. Seldin, 72, 77, 98  
 Washington v. Davis, 960  
 Washington v. Glucksberg, 658  
 Wayman v. Southard, 176, 181, 182  
 Webb v. O'Brien, 826  
 Weber v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., 772, 810, 813, 820, 828, 901, 1027  
 Webster v. Reproductive Health Services, 604  
 Weinberger v. Wiesenfeld, 750, 756, 775, 777, 791, 815  
 Wellness International Network v. Sharif, 33  
 Welton v. Missouri, 422  
 West Coast Hotel v. Parrish, 321, 327, 552, 559  
 West Lynn Creamery v. Healy, 417  
 West v. Atkins, 1125, 1131  
 West Virginia Bd. of Ed. v. Barnette, 616, 765  
 White v. Mass. Council of Construction Employers, 415  
 Whitman v. American Trucking Association, 165, 173, 176, 226  
 Whitney v. California, 641  
 Whole Women's Health v. Hellerstedt, 608  
 Wickard v. Filburn, 333  
 Wiener v. United States, 212  
 Williams v. Rhodes, 1035  
 Williamson v. Lee Optical Co., 564, 782, 993, 1004, 1013  
 Wilson v. Black Bird Creek Marsh Co., 378, 386, 421  
 Windsor, United States v., 694, 1017  
 Wiscart v. Dauchy, 25  
 Wrightwood Dairy Co., United States v., 336  
 Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education, 912, 914  
 Wyoming v. Oklahoma, 401  
 Yakus v. United States, 167  
 Yerger, Ex parte, 26  
 Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 890, 964, 965, 968, 1004, 1120  
 Young, Ex parte, 467, 478, 480, 501, 503, 1064, 1079  
 Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 44, 45, 123, 124  
 Zablocki v. Redhail, 699, 1025  
 Zivotofsky v. Kerry, 148, 164, 241, 246