# CONSTITUTIONAL LAW Spring 2013

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

# **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.

The class meets on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of each week from 2:15 to 3:25 p.m., in Boalt 110.

Office hours are on Wednesdays from 3:45 to 6:00 p.m. in Simon 494.

The final exam consists of two parts: an in-class, one-hour true/false component that counts for 30 percent of the course grade; and a nine-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.

Each numbered reading assignment typically corresponds to one class meeting. This syllabus is subject to revision.

## 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, 108-20 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 Crises**

#### Reconstruction

# 4. The Reconstruction Amendments

Reread the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendments History of the Adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment and notes, 301-10 The Fourteenth Amendment Limited, 319-20 *The Slaughter-House Cases*, 320-36

# 5. 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

# 6. The Private Sphere and State Action

Reread pages 301-09 Establishment of the "Separate but Equal" Doctrine, 357-58 The Civil Rights Cases, 373-85

## 7. "Separate but Equal"

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

## **Economic Rights and Structural Concerns**

#### 8. 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

#### 9. 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

#### The Modern Constitution

# 10. 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

## 11. The Commerce Clause

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

# The Modern Equal Protection Clause: Race

## 12. 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

#### 13. Brown

Background, 893-98

Brown v. Board of Education, 898-902

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

Note: A "Dissent" From Brown, 902-04

Note: Originalism in Antidiscrimination Law, 912-15

Beyond Originalism? 920-23

### 14. Brown II and Hernandez

Reflections on the Opinion in Brown, 923-24

The Enduring Significance of Brown, 925-27

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

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

An Era of Retrenchment, 943-45

#### 15. Strict Scrutiny (Anticlassification vs. Antisubordination)

Hernandez v. Texas and discussion, 1010-14

The Antidiscrimination Principle, 956-59

Loving v. Virginia, 959-66

What Justifies the Suspect Classification Standard? 984-90

## 16. The Intent Standard, Version 1

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

Griggs v. Duke Power, 1024-26

Washington v. Davis, 1026-31

Griggs as a Constitutional Principle and Griggs versus Davis, 1033-34

The Arlington Heights Factors, 1039-40

#### 17. Colorblindness

United Jewish Organizations (UJO) (handout)

University of California v. Bakke, Part I (handout)

Richmond v. Croson, 1081-1109

Adarand v. Pena, 1109-13 (skim)

# 18. The Intent Standard, Version 2: Feeney and After

Discussion following Washington v. Davis, 1031-33

Commentaries on the Intent Standard, 1035-39

McCleskey v. Kemp, 1055-63

Memo from Justice Scalia on McCleskey Draft Opinion (handout)

### 19. Affirmative Action in Higher Education (Diversity)

*University of California v. Bakke, Part II* (handout)

Grutter v. Bollinger, 1120-42

Gratz v. Bollinger, 1142-51(skim)

## 20. Race and Public Policy

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

Ricci v. DeStefano (handout from Brest et al. 2011 supplement)

# The Modern Equal Protection Clause: Gender

#### 21. Intermediate Scrutiny

Reread pages 337-39

Social Movements, 1179-87

Frontiero v. Richardson, 1188-95

The Equal Rights Amendment, 1195-1202

## 22. 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

#### 23. 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

## 24. Permissible Sex-Based Differences

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

## 25. Separate Facilities

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

## 26. 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

### 27. 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

## 28. 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

## 29. Decisions After *Roe*, 1419-24

Planned Parenthood v. Casev, 1424-57

Gonzales v. Carhart (handout from Brest et al. 2011 supplement)

#### 30. Sexual Orientation and Due Process

Sexuality and Sexual Orientation, 1465-66

Bowers v. Hardwick, 1466-82

## 31. Sexual Orientation and Equal Protection

Romer v. Evans, 1505-1515

#### 32. Sexual Orientation and Due Process, Take 2

Lawrence v. Texas, 1482-1505

### Sexual Orientation as a Suspect Classification, 1518-32

## 33. Same-Sex Marriage

California Marriage Cases (handout)

## Other Suspect Classifications and Fundamental Rights

34. Wealth and Education (Substantive Equal Protection) *San Antonio v. Rodriguez*, 1623-41

## 35. Alienage

Citizenship and Alienage Under the Equal Protection Clause, 1156-60

Graham v. Richardson, 1160-63

Bernal v. Fainter, 1163-72

Regulation of Resident Aliens, 1172-77

Plyler v. Doe and note, 1641-47

36. Arizona v. United States (handout)

# The Contemporary Debate over National Power

37. Federalism: Limits on the Commerce Clause

Review pages 554-58

The 1960s Civil Rights Legislation: Commerce or Reconstruction? (Heart of Atlanta

Motel and Katzenbach v. McClung), 558-64

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

United States v. Lopez, 601-27

### 38. Health Care Reform

The Constitutionality of Health Care Reform (handout from Brest et al. 2011 supplement)

39. Limits on the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

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. *Northwest Austin Municipal Utility District Number One (NAMUDNO)* (handout from Brest et al. 2011 supplement)