

CONTENTS

Preface	xxxiii
Acknowledgments	xxxvii
The Constitution of the United States	xxxix

CHAPTER 1

THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL POWER	1
A. The Authority for Judicial Review	1
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i>	2
Notes on <i>Marbury v. Madison</i>	8
Authority for Judicial Review of State Judgments	10
<i>Martin v. Hunter's Lessee</i>	10
<i>Cohens v. Virginia</i>	10
B. Limits on the Federal Judicial Power	11
1. Interpretive Limits	11
How Should the Constitution Be Interpreted?	
The Second Amendment as an Example	13
<i>District of Columbia v. Heller</i>	13
2. Congressional Limits	32
The Exceptions and Regulations Clause	33
<i>Ex Parte McCordle</i>	34
Separation of Powers as a Limit on Congress's Authority	36
<i>United States v. Klein</i>	36
Notes on <i>United States v. Klein</i>	38
<i>Robertson v. Seattle Audubon Society</i>	38
<i>Bank Markazi v. Peterson</i>	38
3. Justiciability Limits	39
a. Prohibition of Advisory Opinions	41
Opinion of the Justices	41
<i>Hayburn's Case</i>	42
<i>Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc.</i>	42
Notes on Advisory Opinions	44
<i>Nashville, C. & St. L. Ry. v. Wallace</i>	44
b. Standing	44
i. Constitutional Standing Requirements	45
<i>Allen v. Wright</i>	45
<i>Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency</i>	52

Notes on Constitutional Standing Requirements:	
Injury, Causation, and Redressability	58
City of Los Angeles v. Lyons	58
Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife	60
Clapper v. Amnesty International USA	63
Linda R. S. v. Richard D.	65
Warth v. Seldin	65
Simon v. Eastern Kentucky Welfare	
Rights Organization	65
Duke Power Co. v. Carolina Environmental	
Study Group, Inc.	66
ii. Prudential Standing Requirements	66
The Prohibition of Third-Party Standing	67
<i>Singleton v. Wulff</i>	67
Barrows v. Jackson	69
Craig v. Boren	69
Gilmore v. Utah	70
The Prohibition of Generalized Grievances	70
<i>United States v. Richardson</i>	71
<i>Flast v. Cohen</i>	74
c. Ripeness	79
<i>Poe v. Ullman</i>	80
<i>Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner</i>	82
United Public Workers v. Mitchell	84
Regional Rail Reorganization Act Cases	84
Lake Carriers Assn. v. MacMullan	84
Susan B. Anthony List v. Driehaus	84
d. Mootness	85
Moore v. Ogilvie	86
Roe v. Wade	86
DeFunis v. Odegaard	87
<i>Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw</i>	
<i>Environmental Services</i>	88
<i>United States Parole Commission v. Geraghty</i>	89
e. The Political Question Doctrine	90
i. The Political Question Doctrine Defined	90
What Is a Political Question? The Issues	
of Malapportionment and Partisan	
Gerrymandering	91
<i>Baker v. Carr</i>	92
<i>Rucho v. Common Cause</i>	95
ii. The Political Question Doctrine Applied:	
Congressional Self-Governance	109
<i>Powell v. McCormack</i>	109
iii. The Political Question Doctrine Applied:	
Foreign Policy	111
<i>Goldwater v. Carter</i>	112
<i>Zivotofsky v. Clinton</i>	114
iv. The Political Question Doctrine Applied:	
Impeachment and Removal	115
<i>Nixon v. United States</i>	116

CHAPTER 2

	THE FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE POWER	119
A. Introduction: Congress and the States		119
The Framework for Analysis: <i>McCulloch v. Maryland</i>		120
<i>McCulloch v. Maryland</i>		121
What Role Should Concern over Protecting States		
Have in Defining Congress's Powers?		130
<i>National Federation of Independent</i>		
<i>Business v. Sebelius</i>		133
B. The Necessary and Proper Clause		155
C. The Commerce Power		155
1. The Initial Era: <i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i> Defines the Commerce Power		156
<i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i>		156
2. The 1890s-1937: A Limited Federal Commerce Power		159
a. What Is "Commerce"?		161
b. What Does "Among the States" Mean?		162
c. Does State Sovereignty Limit Congressional Power?		164
3. 1937-1990s: Broad Federal Commerce Power		166
Key Decisions Changing the Commerce		
Clause Doctrine		167
<i>NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.</i>		167
<i>United States v. Darby</i>		170
<i>Wickard v. Filburn</i>		173
The Meaning of "Commerce Among the States"		175
<i>Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States</i>		175
<i>Katzenbach v. McClung, Sr. & McClung, Jr.</i>		178
<i>Hodel v. Indiana</i>		179
<i>Perez v. United States</i>		180
The Tenth Amendment Between 1937 and the 1990s		181
<i>Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority</i>		183
4. 1990s-??? : Narrowing of the Commerce Power and Revival		
of the Tenth Amendment as a Constraint on Congress		187
a. What Is Congress's Authority to Regulate "Commerce		
Among the States"?		188
<i>United States v. Lopez</i>		188
<i>United States v. Morrison</i>		199
<i>Gonzales v. Raich</i>		207
b. Does the Tenth Amendment Limit Congress's Authority?		216
<i>New York v. United States</i>		216
<i>Printz v. United States</i>		226
<i>Reno v. Condon</i>		234
<i>Murphy v. National Collegiate Athletic Association</i>		236
D. The Taxing and Spending Power		240
For What Purposes May Congress Tax		
and Spend?		241
<i>United States v. Butler</i>		241
<i>Chas. C. Steward Mach. Co. v. Davis</i>		243
<i>Sabri v. United States</i>		243

	Conditions on Grants to State Governments	245
	<i>South Dakota v. Dole</i>	245
E.	Congress's Powers Under the Post-Civil War Amendments	248
1.	Whom May Congress Regulate Under the Post-Civil War Amendments?	248
	<i>United States v. Morrison</i>	251
2.	What Is the Scope of Congress's Power?	253
	<i>Katzenbach v. Morgan & Morgan</i>	254
	<i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i>	258
	<i>Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder</i>	263

CHAPTER 3

	THE FEDERAL EXECUTIVE POWER	275
A.	Inherent Presidential Power	275
	<i>Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer</i>	276
	The Scope of Inherent Power: The Issue of Executive Privilege	285
	<i>United States v. Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States</i>	286
	The Authority of Congress to Increase Executive Power	290
B.	The Constitutional Problems of the Administrative State	292
1.	The Nondelegation Doctrine and Its Demise	292
	<i>A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States</i>	293
	<i>Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan</i>	294
	<i>Gundy v. United States</i>	296
2.	The Legislative Veto and Its Demise	304
	<i>Immigration & Naturalization Service v. Jagdish Rai Chadha</i>	305
3.	Checking Administrative Power	312
	The Appointment Power	313
	<i>Alexia Morrison, Independent Counsel v. Theodore B. Olson</i>	313
	<i>NLRB v. Noel Canning</i>	319
	The Removal Power	328
	The Impeachment of Andrew Johnson	329
	<i>Myers v. United States</i>	329
	<i>Humphrey's Executor v. United States</i>	330
	<i>Wiener v. United States</i>	332
	<i>Bowsher v. Synar</i>	333
	<i>Morrison v. Olson</i>	334
	<i>Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board</i>	336
C.	Separation of Powers and Foreign Policy	339
1.	Are Foreign Policy and Domestic Affairs Different?	340
	<i>United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.</i>	340
	Notes on <i>Curtiss-Wright</i>	341
	<i>Zivotofsky v. Kerry</i>	343

2. Treaties and Executive Agreements	351
<i>Dames & Moore v. Regan, Secretary of the Treasury</i>	352
3. War Powers	354
50 U.S. Code Chapter 33—War Powers Resolution	355
D. Presidential Power and the War on Terrorism	358
1. Detentions	358
<i>Hamdi v. Rumsfeld</i>	359
<i>Boumediene v. Bush</i>	370
2. Military Tribunals	387
Ex Parte Quirin	387
E. Presidential Power over Immigration	395
<i>Trump v. Hawaii</i>	395
F. Checks on the President	406
1. Suing and Prosecuting the President	406
<i>Richard Nixon v. A. Ernest Fitzgerald</i>	406
<i>William Jefferson Clinton v. Paula Corbin Jones</i>	410
2. Impeachment	413

CHAPTER 4

LIMITS ON STATE REGULATORY AND TAXING POWER 419

A. Preemption of State and Local Laws	420
1. Express Preemption	422
<i>Lorillard Tobacco Co. v. Reilly</i>	422
2. Implied Preemption	429
a. Conflicts Preemption	429
Florida Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul, Director, Department of Agriculture of California	429
b. Preemption Because State Law Impedes the Achievement of a Federal Objective	430
<i>Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. State Energy Resources Conservation & Development Commission</i>	430
c. Preemption Because Federal Law Occupies the Field	435
<i>Arizona v. United States</i>	435
B. The Dormant Commerce Clause	444
1. Why a Dormant Commerce Clause?	445
<i>Tennessee Wine and Spirits Retailers Association v. Thomas</i>	446
2. The History of the Dormant Commerce Clause	454
<i>Aaron B. Cooley v. The Board of Wardens of the Port of Philadelphia ex rel. Society for Relief of Distressed Pilots</i>	455
3. Analyzing Whether a Law Violates the Dormant Commerce Clause	457
a. Determining Whether a Law Is Discriminatory	457
Facially Discriminatory Laws	458
<i>City of Philadelphia v. New Jersey</i>	458
Facially Neutral Laws	461
<i>Hunt, Governor of the State of North Carolina v. Washington State Apple Advertising Commission</i>	462
<i>Exxon Corp. v. Governor of Maryland</i>	464

	<i>West Lynn Creamery, Inc. v. Healy, Commissioner of Massachusetts Department of Food & Agriculture</i>	468
	<i>State of Minnesota v. Clover Leaf Creamery Co.</i>	470
b.	Analysis If a Law Is Deemed Discriminatory	471
	<i>Dean Milk Co. v. City of Madison, Wisconsin</i>	472
	<i>Maine v. Taylor & United States</i>	473
c.	Analysis If a Law Is Deemed Nondiscriminatory	475
	<i>Loren J. Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.</i>	475
	<i>Bibb, Director, Department of Public Safety of Illinois v. Navajo Freight Lines, Inc.</i>	477
	Summary	480
d.	Exceptions to the Dormant Commerce Clause	480
	Congressional Approval	481
	<i>Western & Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of Equalization of California</i>	482
	The Market Participant Exception	483
	<i>Reeves, Inc. v. William Stake</i>	483
	White v. Massachusetts Council of Construction Employers, Inc.	485
	<i>South-Central Timber Development, Inc. v. Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources of Alaska</i>	486
C.	The Privileges and Immunities Clause of Article IV, §2	489
1.	Introduction	489
2.	Analysis Under the Privileges and Immunities Clause	490
	What Are the “Privileges and Immunities of Citizenship”?	491
	<i>Toomer v. Witsell</i>	493
	<i>United Building & Construction Trades Council of Camden County v. Mayor & Council of the City of Camden</i>	494
	<i>Lester Baldwin v. Fish & Game Commission of Montana</i>	496
	What Justifications Are Sufficient to Permit Discrimination?	497
	<i>Supreme Court of New Hampshire v. Kathryn A. Piper</i>	497

CHAPTER 5

THE STRUCTURE OF THE CONSTITUTION’S PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES 503

A.	Introduction	503
B.	The Application of the Bill of Rights to the States	504
1.	The Rejection of Application Before the Civil War	504
	<i>Barron v. Mayor & City Council of Baltimore</i>	505
2.	A False Start in Applying the Bill of Rights to the States: The Privileges or Immunities Clause and the <i>Slaughter-House Cases</i>	506

	<i>Slaughter-House Cases: Butchers' Benevolent Association of New Orleans v. Crescent City Live-Stock Landing & Slaughter-House Co.</i>	507
	<i>Saenz v. Roe</i>	514
3.	The Incorporation of the Bill of Rights into the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment	516
	The Debate over Incorporation	518
	Palko v. Connecticut	518
	Adamson v. California	519
	The Current Law as to What's Incorporated	522
	<i>McDonald v. City of Chicago</i>	523
	<i>Timbs v. Indiana</i>	529
	The Content of Incorporated Rights	531
C.	The Application of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution to Private Conduct	532
1.	The Requirement for State Action	532
	<i>The Civil Rights Cases: United States v. Stanley</i>	533
2.	The Exceptions to the State Action Doctrine	536
a.	The Public Functions Exception	538
	<i>Marsh v. Alabama</i>	538
	<i>Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.</i>	540
	<i>Terry v. Adams</i>	543
	<i>Evans v. Newton</i>	544
	<i>Manhattan Community Access Corporation v. Halleck</i>	546
	<i>Hudgens v. National Labor Relations Board</i>	552
b.	The Entanglement Exception	553
	Judicial and Law Enforcement Actions	553
	<i>Shelley v. Kraemer</i>	553
	<i>Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.</i>	557
	<i>Edmonson v. Leesville Concrete Co.</i>	559
	Government Regulation	561
	<i>Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority</i>	561
	<i>Moose Lodge No. 107 v. Irvis</i>	563
	Government Subsidies	566
	<i>Norwood v. Harrison</i>	566
	<i>Rendell-Baker v. Kohn</i>	568
	Entwinement	571
	<i>Brentwood Academy v. Tennessee Secondary School Athletic Association</i>	572

CHAPTER 6

	ECONOMIC LIBERTIES	579
A.	Introduction	579
	Historical Overview	579
	Organization of the Chapter	581

B. Economic Substantive Due Process	581
1. Introduction	581
2. The Early History of Economic Substantive Due Process	582
3. Substantive Due Process of the <i>Lochner</i> Era	584
<i>Allgeyer v. Louisiana</i>	585
<i>Lochner v. New York</i>	586
Laws Protecting Unionizing	592
Maximum Hours Laws	593
<i>Muller v. Oregon</i>	593
Minimum Wage Laws	595
<i>Adkins v. Children's Hospital</i>	595
Consumer Protection Legislation	597
<i>Weaver v. Palmer Bros. Co.</i>	597
4. Economic Substantive Due Process Since 1937	599
Pressures for Change	599
The End of <i>Lochnerism</i>	600
<i>West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish</i>	600
<i>United States v. Carolene Products Co.</i>	602
Economic Substantive Due Process Since 1937	603
<i>Williamson v. Lee Optical of Oklahoma, Inc.</i>	604
The Rebirth of Economic Due Process?	
Constitutional Limits on Punitive Damages	606
<i>BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore</i>	606
<i>State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Campbell</i>	611
Too Much Deference?	618
C. The Contracts Clause	618
1. Introduction	618
2. The Modern Use of the Contracts Clause	619
<i>Home Building & Loan Association v. Blaisdell</i>	619
Government Interference with Private Contracts	622
<i>Energy Reserves Group, Inc. v. Kansas Power & Light Co.</i>	623
Government Interference with Government	
Contracts	627
<i>United States Trust Co. v. New Jersey</i>	627
D. The Takings Clause	631
1. Introduction	631
2. Is There a "Taking"?	632
Possessory Takings	633
<i>Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.</i>	633
<i>Horne v. Department of Agriculture</i>	635
Regulatory Takings	636
<i>Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon</i>	637
<i>Miller v. Schoene</i>	639
<i>Penn Central Transportation Co. v. New York City</i>	641
<i>Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council</i>	644
<i>Nollan v. California Coastal Commn.</i>	650
<i>Palazzolo v. Rhode Island</i>	656
<i>Dolan v. City of Tigard</i>	651
<i>Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe</i>	
Regional Planning Agency	661

3. Is It for “Public Use”?	668
<i>Kelo v. City of New London</i>	669
4. What Is the Requirement for “Just Compensation”?	677
<i>Brown v. Legal Foundation of Washington</i>	678

CHAPTER 7

EQUAL PROTECTION	683
A. Introduction	683
1. Constitutional Provisions Concerning Equal Protection	683
2. A Framework for Equal Protection Analysis	684
Question 1: What Is the Classification?	684
Question 2: What Is the Appropriate Level of Scrutiny?	685
Question 3: Does the Government Action Meet the Level of Scrutiny?	687
The Protection of Fundamental Rights Under Equal Protection	688
B. The Rational Basis Test	689
1. Introduction	689
2. Does the Law Have a Legitimate Purpose?	691
What Constitutes a Legitimate Purpose?	691
<i>Romer v. Evans</i>	691
Must It Be the Actual Purpose, or Is a Conceivable Purpose Enough?	696
3. The Requirement for a “Reasonable Relationship”	698
Tolerance for Underinclusiveness Under Rational Basis Review	698
<i>Railway Express Agency, Inc. v. New York</i>	698
Tolerance for Overinclusiveness Under Rational Basis Review	701
<i>New York City Transit Authority v. Beazer</i>	701
Cases in Which Laws Are Deemed Arbitrary and Unreasonable	704
<i>U.S. Department of Agriculture v. Moreno</i>	705
<i>City of Cleburne, Texas v. Cleburne Living Center, Inc.</i>	707
C. Classifications Based on Race and National Origin	711
1. Race Discrimination and Slavery Before the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments	712
Dred Scott v. Sandford	713
<i>Dred Scott v. Sandford</i>	714
The Post-Civil War Amendments	717
2. Strict Scrutiny for Discrimination Based on Race and National Origin	717
3. Proving the Existence of a Race or National Origin Classification	718
a. Race and National Origin Classifications on the Face of the Law	719

Race-Specific Classifications That Disadvantage	
Racial Minorities	719
<i>Korematsu v. United States</i>	719
Racial Classifications Burdening Both Whites	
and Minorities	724
<i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	725
<i>Palmore v. Sidoti</i>	727
Laws Requiring Separation of the Races	728
<i>Plessy v. Ferguson</i>	729
The Initial Attack on “Separate but Equal”	732
Brown v. Board of Education	732
<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>	733
The Invalidation of Segregation in Other Contexts	736
b. Facially Neutral Laws with a Discriminatory Impact or with	
Discriminatory Administration	738
The Requirement for Proof of a Discriminatory	
Purpose	738
<i>Washington v. Davis</i>	738
<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i>	742
<i>City of Mobile v. Bolden</i>	748
Is Proof of a Discriminatory Effect Also Required?	752
<i>Palmer v. Thompson</i>	752
How Is a Discriminatory Purpose Proven?	754
<i>Personnel Administrator of Massachusetts v. Feeney</i>	754
<i>Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing</i>	
<i>Development Corp.</i>	756
Application: Discriminatory Use of Peremptory	
Challenges	758
4. Remedies: The Problem of School Segregation	760
Introduction: The Problem of Remedies	760
<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>	761
Massive Resistance	762
Judicial Power to Impose Remedies in School	
Desegregation Cases	765
<i>Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education</i>	765
<i>Milliken v. Bradley</i>	769
When Should Federal Desegregation	
Remedies End?	772
<i>Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public</i>	
<i>Schools v. Dowell</i>	772
<i>Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle</i>	
<i>School District No. 1</i>	775
5. Racial Classifications Benefiting Minorities	790
The Emergence of Strict Scrutiny as the Test	792
<i>Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.</i>	792
The Arguments for and Against Strict Scrutiny	802
The Use of Race to Benefit Minorities in College	
and University Admissions	803
<i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i>	803

	<i>Gratz v. Bollinger</i>	819
	<i>Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin</i>	825
	Drawing Election Districts to Increase Minority Representation	833
D.	Gender Classifications	836
1.	The Level of Scrutiny	836
	Early Cases Approving Gender Discrimination	838
	The Emergence of Intermediate Scrutiny	839
	<i>Frontiero v. Richardson</i>	840
	<i>Craig v. Boren</i>	843
	<i>United States v. Virginia</i>	846
2.	Proving the Existence of a Gender Classification	851
	When Is It “Discrimination”?	851
	<i>Geduldig v. Aiello</i>	851
3.	Gender Classifications Benefiting Women	854
	Gender Classifications Based on Role Stereotypes	854
	<i>Orr v. Orr</i>	854
	<i>Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan</i>	856
	<i>Michael M. v. Superior Court of Sonoma County</i>	859
	<i>Rostker v. Goldberg</i>	862
	Gender Classifications Benefiting Women as a Remedy	866
	<i>Califano v. Webster</i>	866
	Classifications Benefiting Women Because of Biological Differences Between Men and Women	867
	<i>Nguyen v. Immigration & Naturalization Service</i>	868
E.	Discrimination Against Non-United States Citizens	876
1.	Strict Scrutiny as the General Rule	877
	<i>Graham v. Richardson</i>	877
2.	Alienage Classifications Related to Self-Government and the Democratic Process	879
	<i>Foley v. Connelie</i>	879
	<i>Ambach v. Norwick</i>	882
3.	Congressionally Approved Discrimination	885
4.	Undocumented Aliens and Equal Protection	886
	<i>Plyler v. Doe</i>	886
F.	Discrimination Against Nonmarital Children	891
	Laws Denying Benefits to All Nonmarital Children	892
	Laws That Provide a Benefit to Some Nonmarital Children	893
G.	Other Types of Discrimination: Only Rational Basis Review	895
1.	Age Classifications	895
	<i>Massachusetts Board of Retirement v. Murgia</i>	895
2.	Discrimination Based on Disability	898
3.	Wealth Discrimination	899
4.	Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation	900

CHAPTER 8

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS UNDER DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION		903
A. Introduction		903
	The Concept of Fundamental Rights	903
	The Ninth Amendment	905
	Procedural Due Process	905
B. Framework for Analyzing Fundamental Rights		906
	First Issue: Is There a Fundamental Right?	906
	Second Issue: Is the Constitutional Right Infringed?	907
	Third Issue: Is There a Sufficient Justification for the Government's Infringement of a Right?	908
	Fourth Issue: Is the Means Sufficiently Related to the Purpose?	908
C. Constitutional Protection for Family Autonomy		909
1. The Right to Marry		909
	<i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	909
	<i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i>	915
2. The Right to Custody of One's Children		929
	<i>Stanley v. Illinois</i>	930
	<i>Michael H. v. Gerald D.</i>	931
3. The Right to Keep the Family Together		938
	<i>Moore v. City of East Cleveland, Ohio</i>	938
4. The Right of Parents to Control the Upbringing of Their Children		942
	<i>Meyer v. Nebraska</i>	942
	<i>Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus & Mary</i>	943
	<i>Troxel v. Granville</i>	945
D. Constitutional Protection for Reproductive Autonomy		950
1. The Right to Procreate		950
	<i>Buck v. Bell</i>	950
	<i>Skinner v. Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson</i>	951
2. The Right to Purchase and Use Contraceptives		952
	<i>Griswold v. Connecticut</i>	953
	<i>Eisenstadt v. Baird</i>	959
3. The Right to Abortion		961
a. The Recognition and Reaffirmation of the Right to Abortion		961
	<i>Roe v. Wade</i>	961
	<i>Planned Parenthood v. Casey</i>	970
b. Government Regulation of Abortions		981
	<i>Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt</i>	982
	<i>Gonzales v. Carhart</i>	988
c. Government Restrictions on Funds and Facilities for Abortions		1001
	<i>Maher v. Roe</i>	1001
	<i>Harris v. McRae</i>	1003

d. Spousal Consent and Notice Requirements	1005
Planned Parenthood v. Danforth	1005
<i>Planned Parenthood v. Casey</i>	1006
e. Parental Notice and Consent Requirements	1011
<i>Bellotti v. Baird</i>	1011
E. Constitutional Protection for Medical Care Decisions	1015
Right to Refuse Treatment	1015
<i>Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health</i>	1016
Right to Physician-Assisted Death	1023
<i>Washington v. Glucksberg</i>	1023
<i>Vacco v. Quill</i>	1028
F. Constitutional Protection for Sexual Orientation and Sexual Activity	1030
<i>Lawrence v. Texas</i>	1031
G. Constitutional Protection for Control over Information	1042
<i>Whalen v. Roe</i>	1043
H. Constitutional Protection for Travel	1046
<i>Saenz v. Roe</i>	1046
Restrictions on Foreign Travel	1052
I. The Right to Vote	1053
1. The Right to Vote as a Fundamental Right	1053
2. Restrictions on the Ability to Vote	1054
Poll Taxes	1054
<i>Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections</i>	1055
Property Ownership Requirements	1056
<i>Kramer v. Union Free School District</i>	1056
Literacy Tests	1059
Prisoners' and Convicted Criminals' Right to Vote	1060
Requirement for Photo Identification for Voting	1061
<i>Crawford v. Marion County Election Board</i>	1061
3. Dilution of the Right to Vote	1071
<i>Reynolds v. Sims</i>	1072
<i>Evenwel v. Abbott</i>	1079
4. Counting "Uncounted" Votes in a Presidential Election: <i>Bush v. Gore</i>	1083
The Events Leading to <i>Bush v. Gore</i>	1083
<i>Bush v. Gore</i>	1087
Issues to Consider Concerning <i>Bush v. Gore</i>	1105
J. Constitutional Protection for Access to Courts	1106
Filing Fees	1108
<i>Boddie v. Connecticut</i>	1108
<i>United States v. Kras</i>	1111
Prisoners' Right of Access to the Courts	1116
<i>Bounds v. Smith</i>	1117
<i>Lewis v. Casey</i>	1119
K. Constitutional Protection for a Right to Education	1121
<i>San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez</i>	1121

L. Procedural Due Process	1128
1. What Is a “Deprivation”?	1130
Is Negligence Sufficient to Constitute a Deprivation?	1130
<i>Daniels v. Williams</i>	1130
<i>County of Sacramento v. Lewis</i>	1131
When Is the Government’s Failure to Protect a Person from Privately Inflicted Harms a Deprivation?	1134
<i>DeShaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services</i>	1134
2. Is It a Deprivation of “Life, Liberty, or Property”?	1140
The “Rights-Privileges” Distinction and Its Demise	1140
<i>Goldberg v. Kelly</i>	1141
What Is a Deprivation of Property?	1145
<i>Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth</i>	1146
What Is a Deprivation of Liberty?	1151
Reputation as a Liberty Interest	1151
<i>Goss v. Lopez</i>	1151
<i>Paul v. Davis</i>	1154
Liberty Interest for Prisoners	1156
<i>Sandin v. Conner</i>	1159
3. What Procedures Are Required?	1162
<i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i>	1163
Government Employment	1167
Family Rights	1167
Substantive and Procedural Due Process: The Relationship	1169
<i>District Attorney’s Office for the Third Judicial District v. Osborne</i>	1169

CHAPTER 9

FIRST AMENDMENT: FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION	1177
A. Introduction	1177
1. Historical Background	1177
2. Why Should Freedom of Speech Be a Fundamental Right?	1179
a. Self-Governance	1180
b. Discovering Truth	1181
c. Advancing Autonomy	1183
d. Promoting Tolerance	1184
e. Conclusion	1184
3. The Issues in Free Expression Analysis	1184
B. Free Speech Methodology	1186
1. The Distinction Between Content-Based and Content-Neutral Laws	1186
a. The Importance of the Distinction	1186
<i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i>	1187

b.	How Is It Determined Whether a Law Is Content-Based?	1194
	The Requirement for Viewpoint Neutrality	1195
	<i>Matal v. Tam</i>	1195
	Subject-Matter Restrictions	1201
	<i>Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar</i>	1202
	Content-Neutral Laws	1210
c.	Problems in Applying the Distinction Between Content-Based and Content-Neutral Laws	1211
i.	Permissible Purposes and Content Neutrality	1211
	<i>City of Renton v. Playtime Theatres, Inc.</i>	1211
ii.	When the Government Must Make Content-Based Choices	1215
	<i>National Endowment for the Arts v. Finley</i>	1215
iii.	Government Speech	1219
	<i>Pleasant Grove City, Utah v. Summum</i>	1219
	<i>Walker v. Texas Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans</i>	1223
2.	Vagueness and Overbreadth	1229
a.	Vagueness	1229
	<i>Coates v. City of Cincinnati</i>	1230
b.	Overbreadth	1231
	<i>Schad v. Borough of Mount Ephraim</i>	1231
c.	Relationship Between Vagueness and Overbreadth	1236
	Board of Airport Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles v. Jews for Jesus, Inc.	1236
3.	Prior Restraints	1237
a.	What Is a Prior Restraint?	1237
b.	Are Prior Restraints Really So Bad?	1238
i.	Court Orders as a Prior Restraint	1240
	<i>Near v. State of Minnesota ex rel. Olson</i>	1240
ii.	Court Orders to Protect National Security	1242
	<i>New York Times Co. v. United States</i>	1243
iii.	Court Orders to Protect Fair Trials	1249
	<i>Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart</i>	1249
iv.	Court Orders Seizing the Assets of Businesses Convicted of Obscenity Violations	1254
	<i>Alexander v. United States</i>	1255
c.	Licensing as a Prior Restraint	1257
	<i>Lovell v. City of Griffin, Ga.</i>	1257
	<i>Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of New York, Inc. v. Village of Stratton</i>	1258
i.	Important Reason for Licensing	1263
ii.	Clear Standards Leaving Almost No Discretion to the Government	1263
	<i>City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.</i>	1263
iii.	Procedural Safeguards	1265
4.	What Is an Infringement of Freedom of Speech?	1266
	Civil Liability and Denial of Compensation for Speech	1267
	Prohibitions on Compensation	1268
	<i>United States v. National Treasury Employees Union</i>	1268
	<i>Compelled Speech</i>	1270

	<i>West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette</i>	1270
	<i>National Federation of Family and Life Advocates v. Becerra</i>	1273
	<i>Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic & Institutional Rights, Inc.</i>	1284
	<i>McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission</i>	1289
	Unconstitutional Conditions	1294
	Speiser v. Randall	1294
	<i>Rust v. Sullivan</i>	1295
	<i>Legal Services Corp. v. Velazquez</i>	1299
	Government Pressures	1306
C.	Types of Unprotected and Less Protected Speech	1308
1.	Incitement of Illegal Activity	1309
a.	The “Clear and Present Danger” Test	1310
	<i>Schenck v. United States</i>	1311
	<i>Frohwerk v. United States</i>	1312
	<i>Debs v. United States</i>	1313
	<i>Abrams v. United States</i>	1314
b.	The Reasonableness Approach	1317
	<i>Gitlow v. New York</i>	1317
	<i>Whitney v. California</i>	1320
c.	The Risk Formula Approach	1323
	<i>Dennis v. United States</i>	1324
d.	The <i>Brandenburg</i> Test	1329
	<i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i>	1330
	<i>Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project</i>	1332
2.	Fighting Words, the Hostile Audience, and the Problem of Racist Speech	1341
a.	Fighting Words	1341
	<i>Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire</i>	1341
i.	Narrowing the Fighting Words Doctrine	1343
ii.	Fighting Words Laws Invalidated as Vague and Overbroad	1344
	<i>Gooding v. Wilson</i>	1344
iii.	Narrow Fighting Words Laws as Content-Based Restrictions	1346
	<i>R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, Minnesota</i>	1347
b.	The Hostile Audience Cases	1353
	The Problem of Racist Speech	1355
	<i>Virginia v. Black</i>	1357
3.	Sexually Oriented Speech	1365
a.	Obscenity	1365
i.	Supreme Court Decisions Finding Obscenity	
	Unprotected	1365
	<i>Roth v. United States</i>	1366
	<i>Paris Adult Theatre I v. Slaton</i>	1368
	<i>Miller v. California</i>	1370
ii.	Should Obscenity Be a Category of Unprotected Speech?	1372
iii.	Should There Be a New Exception for Pornography?	1374

b. Child Pornography	1375
<i>New York v. Ferber</i>	1376
c. Protected but Low-Value Sexual Speech	1380
i. Zoning Ordinances	1380
<i>Young v. American Mini Theatres, Inc.</i>	1380
ii. Nude Dancing	1383
<i>City of Erie v. Pap's A.M.</i>	1384
iii. Should There Be Such a Category as Low-Value Sexual Speech?	1388
d. Government Techniques for Controlling Obscenity and Child Pornography	1389
<i>Stanley v. Georgia</i>	1389
Osborne v. Ohio	1390
e. Profanity and "Indecent" Speech	1391
<i>Cohen v. California</i>	1391
i. The Broadcast Media	1395
<i>Federal Communications Commission v. Pacifica Foundation</i>	1395
ii. Telephones	1398
iii. The Internet	1398
<i>Reno v. American Civil Liberties Union</i>	1398
iv. Cable Television	1402
4. A New Exception for Violent Speech?	1404
<i>United States v. Stevens</i>	1404
<i>Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association</i>	1411
5. Commercial Speech	1419
a. Constitutional Protection for Commercial Speech	1419
<i>Virginia State Board of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, Inc.</i>	1420
Overview of the Section	1425
b. What Is Commercial Speech?	1425
<i>Bolger v. Youngs Drug Products Corp.</i>	1426
<i>Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.</i>	1427
c. The Test for Evaluating Regulation of Commercial Speech	1434
<i>Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission of New York</i>	1434
Is Least Restrictive Alternative Analysis Applicable?	1437
d. Advertising of Illegal Activities	1439
e. False and Deceptive Advertising	1439
f. Advertising That Inherently Risks Deception	1440
Restrictions on Trade Names	1440
Attorney Solicitation of Prospective Clients	1440
Solicitation by Accountants	1442
g. Regulating Commercial Speech to Achieve Other Goals	1442
i. "For Sale" Signs on Houses	1443
ii. Alcohol Products	1443
<i>44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island</i>	1444
iii. Tobacco Products	1445
<i>Lorillard Tobacco Co. v. Reilly</i>	1446
iv. Gambling	1451
v. Advertising by Lawyers and Other Professionals	1452

6. Reputation, Privacy, Publicity, and the First Amendment: Torts and the First Amendment	1454
a. Defamation	1455
i. Public Officials as Defamation Plaintiffs	1455
<i>New York Times Co. v. Sullivan</i>	1455
ii. Public Figures as Plaintiffs	1461
<i>Gertz v. Welch</i>	1462
iii. Private Figures, Matters of Public Concern	1467
iv. Private Figures, Matters Not of Public Concern	1468
v. Conclusion	1468
b. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress	1469
<i>Hustler Magazine v. Falwell</i>	1469
<i>Snyder v. Phelps</i>	1471
c. Public Disclosure of Private Facts	1476
<i>Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn</i>	1476
Information from Nongovernment Sources	1479
d. Right of Publicity	1480
7. Conduct That Communicates	1481
a. What Is Speech?	1481
b. When Is Conduct Communicative?	1481
c. When May the Government Regulate Conduct That Communicates?	1482
i. The <i>O'Brien</i> Test	1482
<i>United States v. O'Brien</i>	1482
ii. Flag Desecration	1486
<i>Texas v. Johnson</i>	1486
iii. Spending Money as Political Speech	1491
<i>Buckley v. Valeo</i>	1492
Criticisms of <i>Buckley</i>	1499
The Continuing Distinction Between Contributions and Expenditures	1500
When Are Contribution Limits Too Low?	1500
Are Corporate Expenditures Protected Speech?	1502
<i>First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti</i>	1502
Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission	1506
The Constitutionality of Public Financing of Elections	1523
Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club PAC v. Bennett	1523
D. What Places Are Available for Speech?	1531
1. Government Properties and Speech	1531
a. Initial Rejection and Subsequent Recognition of a Right to Use Government Property for Speech	1531
<i>Hague v. Committee for Industrial Organization</i>	1532
<i>Schneider v. New Jersey</i>	1533
b. What Government Property and Under What Circumstances?	1535
c. Public Forums	1537
i. Content Neutrality	1537
<i>Police Department of the City of Chicago v. Mosley</i>	1537

ii. Time, Place, and Manner Restrictions	1539
<i>Hill v. Colorado</i>	1540
<i>McCullen v. Coakley</i>	1545
iii. Licensing and Permit Systems	1555
iv. No Requirement for Use of the Least Restrictive Alternative	1556
<i>Ward v. Rock Against Racism</i>	1556
d. Designated Public Forums	1558
e. Limited Public Forums	1559
<i>Christian Legal Society Chapter of the University of California, Hastings College of the Law v. Martinez</i>	1559
f. Nonpublic Forums	1570
2. Private Property and Speech	1574
3. Speech in Authoritarian Environments: Military, Prisons, and Schools	1575
a. Military	1575
<i>Parker v. Levy</i>	1576
b. Prisons	1578
<i>Thornburgh v. Abbott</i>	1578
c. Schools	1582
<i>Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District</i>	1583
<i>Bethel School District No. 403 v. Fraser</i>	1586
<i>Morse v. Frederick</i>	1589
d. The Speech Rights of Government Employees	1597
<i>Garcetti v. Ceballos</i>	1598
E. Freedom of Association	1605
1. Laws Prohibiting and Punishing Membership	1606
2. Laws Requiring Disclosure of Membership	1608
<i>NAACP v. State of Alabama ex rel. Patterson</i>	1608
Campaign Finance Disclosure	1610
3. Compelled Association	1610
<i>Janus v. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Council 31</i>	1611
<i>Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System v. Southworth</i>	1621
4. Laws Prohibiting Discrimination	1624
<i>Roberts v. United States Jaycees</i>	1625
<i>Boy Scouts of America v. Dale</i>	1630
F. Freedom of the Press	1635
1. Introduction: Are There Special Rights for the Press?	1635
2. Freedom of the Press as a Shield to Protect the Press from the Government	1636
a. Taxes on the Press	1636
<i>Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. v. Minnesota Commissioner of Revenue</i>	1637
b. Application of General Regulatory Laws	1641
<i>Cohen v. Cowles Media Co.</i>	1642
c. Keeping Reporters' Sources and Secrets Confidential	1644
<i>Branzburg v. Hayes</i>	1644
d. Laws Requiring That the Media Make Access Available	1651

3. Freedom of the Press as a Sword: A First Amendment Right of Access to Government Places and Papers?	1652
a. Access to Judicial Proceedings	1653
<i>Richmond Newspapers v. Virginia</i>	1653
b. Prisons	1659
<i>Houchins v. KQED</i>	1660

CHAPTER 10

FIRST AMENDMENT: RELIGION	1665
A. Introduction	1665
1. Constitutional Provisions Concerning Religion and the Tension Between Them	1665
2. History in Interpreting the Religion Clauses	1667
3. What Is Religion?	1668
The Attempt to Define Religion Under the Selective Service Act	1669
<i>United States v. Seeger</i>	1669
Requirement for Sincerely Held Beliefs	1671
<i>United States v. Ballard</i>	1672
The Relevance of Religious Dogma and Shared Beliefs	1674
B. The Free Exercise Clause	1675
1. Introduction: Free Exercise Clause Issues	1675
2. The Law Before <i>Employment Division v. Smith</i>	1676
a. Government Benefit Cases	1678
b. Compulsory Schooling	1678
c. Cases Rejecting Exemptions Based on the Free Exercise Clause	1679
3. The Current Test	1681
<i>Employment Division, Department of Human Resources of Oregon v. Smith</i>	1681
4. Supreme Court Decisions Since <i>Employment Division v. Smith</i>	1689
a. Animus Against Religion	1689
<i>Masterpiece Cake Shop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission</i>	1690
b. Interfering with Choices as to Clergy	1700
c. Denial of Funding to Religious Entities	1700
<i>Locke v. Davey</i>	1700
<i>Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer</i>	1703
5. Statutory Protection of Religious Freedom	1715
C. The Establishment Clause	1717
1. Competing Theories of the Establishment Clause	1717
a. Strict Separation	1718
b. Neutrality Theory	1719

c. Accommodation	1721
d. The Theories Applied: An Example	1723
<i>County of Allegheny v. American Civil Liberties Union, Greater Pittsburgh Chapter</i>	1723
2. Government Discrimination Among Religions	1727
3. The <i>Lemon</i> Test for the Establishment Clause	1728
<i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i>	1728
The Requirement for a Secular Purpose	1730
The Requirement for a Secular Effect	1731
The Prohibition of Excessive Entanglement	1732
4. Religious Speech and the First Amendment	1733
a. Religious Group Access to School Facilities	1733
b. Student Religious Groups' Receipt of Government Funds	1735
5. When Can Religion Become a Part of Government Activities?	1736
a. Religion as a Part of Government Activities: Schools	1736
Release Time	1736
School Prayers and Bible Reading	1737
<i>Engel v. Vitale</i>	1737
<i>Lee v. Weisman</i>	1740
<i>Santa Fe Independent School District v. Doe</i>	1747
Curricular Decisions	1752
b. Religion as a Part of Government Activities: Legislative Chaplains	1752
<i>Town of Greece v. Galloway</i>	1753
c. Religion as a Part of Government Activities: Religious Symbols on Government Property	1762
<i>McCreary County v. American Civil Liberties Union of Kentucky</i>	1762
<i>Van Orden v. Perry</i>	1772
<i>American Legion v. American Humanist Association</i>	1782
6. When Can Government Give Aid to Religion?	1790
Aid to Parochial Elementary and Secondary Schools	1791
<i>Mitchell v. Helms</i>	1792
<i>Zelman v. Simmons-Harris</i>	1803
Tax Exemptions for Religious Organizations	1818
Aid to Religious Colleges and Universities	1819
Aid to Religious Institutions Other than Schools	1821
<i>Table of Cases</i>	1823
<i>Index</i>	1841