CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: BASIC ISSUES Spring 2011

Prof. Haney López Simon 494; 3-2669 ihl@law.berkeley.edu

(This is last year's syllabus; the Spring '12 course will be substantially similar)

Syllabus

The principal text for this introductory constitutional law course is Brest, Levinson, Balkin, Amar & Siegel, *Processes of Constitutional Decisionmaking: Cases and Materials*, 5th Ed.

Class meets on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays from 10:00 until 11:10 a.m., in Boalt 105.

There will be no class or office hours on Friday March 4 and Friday March 18. Instead, there will be make-up classes on Friday January 28 and Friday February 4, from 1:00 to 2:10 p.m., in Boalt 105

Office hours typically will be each Friday from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at Café Zeb.

The final exam will consist of two parts: an in-class, one-hour true/false component that will count for 30 percent of the course grade; and a forty-eight hour take-home essay worth 70 percent of the course grade. Students may schedule the take-home portion at their convenience during the exam period. The schedule for the in-class exam will be announced later.

Interpreting the Constitution

- 1. Introduction to the Course
 Background to the Constitution, 19-26
 The Constitution of the United States, 1-15
- 2. The Supreme Court as Expositor of the Constitution
 The Supreme Court in Its Initial Years: 1789-1801, 97-99
 The Election of 1800, 99-103
 Marbury v. Madison, 108-21
 The Marshall Court, 136-38
- 3. Theories of Judicial Review
 Discussion, 121-24
 Precedents for Judicial Review, 124-25
 Judicial Review in a Democratic Polity, 126-36

Constitutional Crisis

Race and Reconstruction

4. Slavery

The Taney Court, 187-91 Slavery (the Missouri Compromise), 212-13 Prelude to Secession, 226-28 Dred Scott v. Sandford, 229-45 Discussion, 245-53

5. The Reconstruction Amendments

Reread the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments History of the Adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment and notes, 301-14 The Fourteenth Amendment Limited, 319-20 *The Slaughter-House Cases*, 320-36

6. Early Application of the Fourteenth Amendment to Women

Women's Citizenship in the Antebellum Period, 164-68 *Bradwell v. Illinois*, 337-39 The "New Departure" and Women's Place in the Constitutional Order, 340-43 *Minor v. Happersett*, 343-46

7. The Private Sphere and State Action

Strauder v. West Virginia, 351-57 Reread pages 301-09 Establishment of the "Separate but Equal" Doctrine, 357-58 The Civil Rights Cases, 373-85

8. "Separate but Equal"

Plessy v. Ferguson, 359-69 The Spirit of Plessy, 370-73

The Modern Constitution

Economic Rights and Structural Concerns

9. The Lochner Era: Substantive Due Process

Pressures for Intervention and the Rise of Substantive Due Process, 1874-1890, 412-15 *Lochner v. New York* and notes, 417-31

10. The Commerce Clause

Congressional Regulation of Interstate Commerce, 435-37

Champion v. Ames, 437-41

Hammer v. Dagenhart, 441-45

Prisoner's Dilemmas, 445-47

11. The New Deal and Economic Due Process (Rational Review)

Constitutional Adjudication in the Modern World ("Incorporation"), 485-93 The Decline of Judicial Intervention Against Economic Regulation, 499-501 1935-1937, 510-11

United States v. Carolene Products, 513-20

Williamson v. Lee Optical, 520-27

Reread Judicial Review in a Democratic Polity, 126-36

12. The Commerce Clause

Relaxation of Judicial Constraints on Congressional Power, 549-51 *United States v. Darby*, 551-58

The Modern Equal Protection Clause: Race

13. Racial Discrimination and National Security

Ethnic Diversity and the Constitution (*Chae Chan Ping v. United States*), 398-405 *Korematsu v. United States* and note, 967-81

14. Brown

Background, 893-98

Brown v. Board of Education and notes, 898-904

Brown and Constitutional Interpretation, 904-23

Reflections on the Opinion in Brown, 923-24

15. Brown II and School Desegregation

The Enduring Significance of Brown, 925-27

Four Decades of School Desegregation (Brown II, Green, Swann), 928-36

16. Retrenchment

School Segregation in the North (Keyes), 936-41

The Turning Point—Interdistrict Relief (*Milliken v. Bradley*), 941-43

An Era of Retrenchment (Missouri v. Jenkins), 943-50

17. Race, Wealth, and Education (Substantive Equal Protection)

San Antonio v. Rodriguez, 1623-41

18. Strict Scrutiny

The Antidiscrimination Principle, 956-59

Loving v. Virginia, 959-66

Hernandez v. Texas, 1010-14

What Justifies the Suspect Classification Standard? 981-90

19. The Intent Standard

What is a Race-Dependent Decision? (Yick Wo, Queue Ordinance Case, Gomillion, Gaston County, Griggs) 1020-24

Griggs v. Duke Power, 1024-26

Washington v. Davis, 1026-35

20. Disproportionate Impact

Commentaries on the Intent Standard, 1035-39

Judicial Review of Motivation (Arlington Heights), 1039-42

McCleskey v. Kemp, 1055-63

Clary v. United States, 1045-48

21. Affirmative Action

University of California v. Bakke, 1071-77

Affirmative Action from Bakke to Croson, 1077-81

Richmond v. Croson, 1081-1109

Adarand v. Pena, 1109-13 (skim)

22. Grutter and Gratz

Grutter v. Bollinger, 1120-42 (skim)

Gratz v. Bollinger, 1142-51(skim)

Affirmative Action and the Original Understanding, 1114-20

Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1 (handout)

Reread pages 362-65

The Modern Equal Protection Clause: Gender

23. Intermediate Scrutiny

Reread pages 337-39

Social Movements, 1179-87

Frontiero v. Richardson, 1188-95

The Equal Rights Amendment, 1195-1202

24. Relevant Differences or Stereotypes

What Justifies Special Constitutional Scrutiny, 1202-13

What Does Intermediate Scrutiny Prohibit? (Craig v. Boren), 1213-19

On Sex, Gender, and Sexual Orientation, 1224-26

Jury Service (J.E.B. v. Alabama), 1226-28

Prof. Haney López/Constitutional Law: Basic Issues/Spring2011

25. Not Sex-Based Differences

Personnel Administrator of Massachusetts v. Feeney, 1262-71 Domestic Violence and Marital Rape, 1271-76 Geduldig v. Aiello and notes, 1276-81

26. Permissible Sex-Based Differences

Michael M. v. Superior Court of Sonoma, 1282-95

27. Separate Facilities

United States v. Virginia (The VMI Case), 1229-55

28. Affirmative Action, Intersectionality, and Marriage

Affirmative Action, 1323-27

Discrimination against Women of Color, 1258-59

Intermediate Scrutiny and Same-Sex Marriage, 1219-24

Modern Substantive Due Process

29. Implied Fundamental Rights: Contraception

The Ninth Amendment, 151-53

Antecedents of Fundamental Rights Adjudication, 1339-42

Griswold v. Connecticut, 1342-55

Theories of Fundamental Rights Adjudication, 1355-65

30. Implied Fundamental Rights: Abortion

Roe v. Wade, discussion and note, 1387-1409 Reread Abortion and Equal Protection, 1279-81 Abortion and the Equal Protection Clause, 1409-19

31. Decisions After Roe, 1419-24

Planned Parenthood v. Casey, 1424-65

32. Sexual Orientation and Due Process

Sexuality and Sexual Orientation, 1465-66

Bowers v. Hardwick, 1466-82

33. Sexual Orientation and Equal Protection

Romer v. Evans, 1505-1518

Expressive Association (Dale), 1532-36

34. Sexual Orientation and Due Process, Take 2

Lawrence v. Texas, 1482-1505

Sexual Orientation as a Suspect Classification, 1518-32

35. Same-Sex Marriage

Goodridge v. Department of Public Health, 1545-68

Other Suspect Classifications and Fundamental Rights

36. Alienage

Citizenship and Alienage Under the Equal Protection Clause, 1156-60 *Graham v. Richardson*, 1160-63 *Bernal v. Fainter*, 1163-1172 Regulation of Resident Aliens, 1172-77 *Plyler v. Doe* and note, 1641-52

37. Disability

City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, 1327-38

The Contemporary Debate over National Power

38. Federalism: Limits on the Commerce Clause

Review pages 554-64

The Rehnquist Court: Finding Limits on Federal Power, 600-01

United States v. Lopez, 601-27

39. Limits on the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

The 1960s Civil Rights Legislation: Commerce or Reconstruction? (*Heart of Atlanta Motel* and *Katzenbach v. McClung*), 558-64

Mapping the Middle Ground: Jones v. Mayer and Oregon v. Mitchell, 591-600

The Reconstruction Power, 629 *City of Boerne v. Flores*, 629-49

40. The Fourteenth Amendment Unbound

Bush v. Gore (handout)