SECOND EDITION

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW FOR A CHANGING AMERICA

RIGHTS, LIBERTIES, AND JUSTICE



LEE EPSTEIN AND THOMAS G. WALKER

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW FOR A CHANGING AMERICA

RIGHTS, LIBERTIES, AND JUSTICE

SECOND EDITION

LEE EPSTEIN
Washington University

THOMAS G. WALKER
Emory University

A DIVISION OF
CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INC.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Book design by Kachergis Book Design, Pittsboro, North Carolina.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Epstein, Lee, 1958-
Constitutional law for a changing America :
rights, liberties, and justice / Lee Epstein,
Thomas G. Walker - 2nd ed.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-87187-830-5
1. Civil rights-United States. 2. United States-
Constitutional law. 3. Judicial process-United States.
4. United States. Supreme Court. I. Walker, Thomas G.
II. Title.
KF4749.E67 1995
342.73'085-dc20 94-33980
[347.30285] CIP

In honor of our parents

Ann and Kenneth Spole

Josephine and George Walker

PREFACE

Three years have passed since *Constitutional Law for a Changing America: Rights, Liberties, and Justice* made its debut in a discipline already supplied with many fine casebooks by law professors, historians, and social scientists. We believed then, as we do now, that there was a need for a fresh approach because, as political science professors who regularly teach courses on public law, and as scholars concerned with judicial processes, we saw a growing disparity between what we were teaching and what our research taught us.

We had adopted books for our classes that focused primarily on Supreme Court decisions and how the Court applied the resulting legal precedents to subsequent disputes, but as scholars we knew that the law is only one slice of the pie. A host of political factors—internal and external—influence the Court's decisions and shape the development of constitutional law. Among the more significant forces at work are the ways that lawyers and interest groups frame legal disputes, the ideological and behavioral propensities of the justices, the politics of judicial selection, public opinion, and the positions taken by elected officials, to name just a few.

Because we thought no existing book adequately combined the lessons of the legal model with the influences of the political process, we wrote one. In most respects, our book follows tradition: readers will find, for example, that we include the classic cases that best illustrate the development of constitutional law. But our focus—and even the appearance of this volume—is different. We emphasize the arguments raised by lawyers and interest groups, and we include tables and figures on Court trends, profiles of influential justices and organizations, and other materials that bring out the rich political context in which decisions are reached. As a result, students and instructors will find this work both similar to and different from casebooks they may have read before.

Integrating traditional teaching and research concerns was only one of our goals. Another was to animate the subject of public law. As instructors, we find our subject inherently interesting—to us public law is exciting stuff. The typical constitutional law book, however, could not be less inviting in design, presentation, or prose. That kind of book seems to dampen enthusiasm. We have written a book that we hope mirrors the excitement we feel for our subject. Along with cases excerpted in the traditional manner, we have included full descriptions of the events that led to the suits, photographs of litigants, and relevant ex-

hibits from the cases. We hope these materials demonstrate to students that Supreme Court cases are more than just legal names and citations, that they involve real people engaged in real disputes. Readers will also find reference material designed to enhance their understanding of the law—information on the Supreme Court decision-making process, the structure of the federal judiciary, material on briefing court cases, a glossary of legal terms, and biographical information on the justices.

In preparing this second edition, we have strengthened the distinctive features of the first. Readers will find changes at all three levels of the book—overall organization, chapters, and cases. Beginning with the organization of the volume, we restructured the material on Supreme Court decision making, adding new information on legal and political approaches and creating a separate chapter, "Approaches to Supreme Court Decision Making." This addition eliminates the need for supplemental readings on the various theories that have been offered to explain Court decisions. The new chapter also sets the stage for an important theme developed throughout the book—many factors, not just precedent, influence the direction and content of Court decisions. Another organizational change involved the "Freedom of Expression" chapter. It is now divided into three chapters dealing, respectively, with speech, press, and obscenity and libel, which should make for more manageable reading and instruction.

Readers will find the most significant changes within individual chapters. All the chapters have been thoroughly updated, containing opinions handed down during the 1991, 1992, and 1993 terms. In some, we have added a few oldies but goodies, including *Duncan v. Louisiana, Sherbert v. Verner,* and *Goldman v. Weinberger.* Where relevant, we also updated the narrative to take into account recent events in the legal and political environments. The chapter on obscenity and libel, for example, now includes a discussion of feminist arguments against pornography; hate speech also plays a prominent role in our examination of freedom of expression.

Several chapters have been completely revised—with "Religion: Exercise and Establishment" the most prominent example. There, we rewrote the Free Exercise section to emphasize major doctrinal changes occurring over the past three decades and to highlight the interaction between Congress and the Court. Readers will also find changes in the Establishment section. There, we modified the chronological approach to stress instead the substance of the cases.

In the privacy chapter we streamlined the discussion of cases outside the reproductive realm, while reorganizing the material on abortion. Excerpts on reproductive choice now focus exclusively on the legal standard articulated in *Roe v. Wade;* they demonstrate how the *Roe* standard has changed over time and speculate on why alterations have occurred. In making this change, we do not neglect cases involving parental consent and funding of abortions: they receive treatment in the narrative. And abortion protest—a subject of contemporary concern—receives coverage in the Freedom of Expression chapter.

Finally, readers will note two kinds of changes in our presentation of Court cases. First, we added excerpts from many dissenting and concurring opinions; in fact, virtually all cases analyzed in the text now include one or the other or both. Although these opinions lack the force of precedent, they are useful in helping students to see alternative points of view. Second, to retain the historical flavor of the decisions, we reprinted verbatim the original language used in the *U.S. Reports* to introduce opinions. Students will see that during most of its history, the Court used the term "Mr." to refer to justices, as in "Mr. Justice Holmes delivered the opinion of the Court" or "Mr. Justice Harlan, dissenting." In 1980 the Court dropped the "Mr." This point may seem minor, but we think it is evidence that the justices, like other Americans, have updated their usage to reflect fundamental changes in American society—in this case, the

emergence of women as a force in the legal profession and shortly thereafter on the Court itself.

One thing has not changed—our intention to keep the text up to date with an annual supplement containing the latest important opinions. A separate volume, the supplement will be packaged with the text (the first will appear in August 1995), and will be cumulative until the next edition of the book is published. Making the supplement available at the beginning of the fall semester means the new cases can be included in the syllabus whether the course is taught in the fall or spring.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although the first edition of this volume was published only three years ago, it had been in the works for many more. During those developmental years, numerous people provided guidance, but none as much as Joanne Daniels, a former editor at CQ Press. It was Joanne who conceived of a constitutional law book that would be accessible, sophisticated, and contemporary. And it was Joanne who brought that concept to our attention and helped us develop it into a book. We are forever in her debt.

Since this new edition charts the same course as the original volume, we remain grateful to all of those who had a hand in the first. They include David Tarr and Jeanne Ferris at CQ Press, Joseph A. Kobylka of Southern Methodist University, and our many colleagues who reviewed and commented on it: Judith A. Baer, Ralph Baker, Lawrence Baum, John Brigham, Gregory A. Caldeira, Robert A. Carp, Phillip J. Cooper, John B. Gates, Wayne McIntosh, John A. Maltese, Richard J. Pacelle, Jr., C. K. Rowland, and Donald R. Songer.

We have accumulated equally as many, if not more, debts in producing this edition. First and foremost, we owe much to two editors at CQ Press, Brenda Carter and Carolyn Goldinger. Brenda brought a (much needed) fresh eye to the project. She had many ideas about the direction the revision should take and managed to convey them in such a way as to make them seem like ours, not hers. But we know better and herein acknowledge her major contribution to the volume. In the preface to the previous edition, we said that Carolyn Goldinger, our copy editor, was "nothing short of a saint," and her halo has not slipped. Her imprint is everywhere: she managed to translate our (too often) jargonistic writing into accessible prose; she (correctly) questioned our interpretation of certain events and opinions; she even made our tables and figures understandable. We also are grateful to Jamie R. Holland for her skill and persistence in tracking down elusive photographs.

We thank our colleagues who offered valuable suggestions for revision: Bradley C. Canon, Sue Davis, John Fliter, Edward V. Heck, Kevin McGuire, Susan Mezey, and Harry P. Stumpf. Many thanks go to Jeffrey A. Segal for his frank appraisal of the earlier work and his willingness to discuss even half-baked ideas for changes. Jack Knight, who read drafts of several chapters, also deserves special acknowledgment.

Our home institutions provided substantial support, not complaining when presented with astronomical telephone bills, postal fees, and copying expenses. For this and all the moral support they provide, we thank our department chairs, John Sprague (Washington University) and Harvey E. Klehr (Emory University).

Finally, we acknowledge the support of our friends and families. We are forever grateful to our former professors for instilling in us their genuine interest in and curiosity about things judicial and legal, and to our parents for their unequivocal support. Walker expresses his special thanks to Aimee and Emily for always being there; and Epstein to her husband Jay for enduring all that he does not have to (but does, anyway), without complaining (much).

Any errors of omission or commission remain our sole responsibility. We encourage students and instructors alike to comment on the book and to inform us of any errors.

CONTENTS

Preface xiii

I THE CONSTITUTION AND THE RIGHTS OF AMERICANS

The Living Constitution 3
The Amendment Process 7
The Supreme Court and the Amendment Process 9

1. APPROACHES TO SUPREME COURT DECISION MAKING 13
Legally Relevant Approaches 13
Extralegal Approaches 24
READINGS 41

2. INCORPORATION OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS 43
Must States Abide by the Bill of Rights?
Initial Responses 43
Barron v. Baltimore (1833) 44
Incorporation Through the Fourteenth Amendment:
Early Interpretations 46
Hurtado v. California (1884) 48
New Life for Incorporation 52
Twining v. New Jersey (1908) 53
Incorporation in the Wake of *Twining* 55
Palko v. Connecticut (1937) 56
In the Aftermath of *Palko:* Incorporation and the Warren Court 58
Duncan v. Louisiana (1968) 60
READINGS 66

II CIVIL LIBERTIES

Approaching Civil Liberties 69

3. RELIGION: EXERCISE AND ESTABLISHMENT 73
Defining Religion 74
Free Exercise of Religion 78
Cantwell v. Connecticut (1940) 80
Sherbert v. Verner (1963) 88
Wisconsin v. Yoder (1972) 93
Goldman v. Weinberger (1986) 99
Employment Division, Department of Human Resources of Oregon v. Smith (1990) 107
Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah (1993) 116
Religious Establishment 126
Everson v. Board of Education (1947) 131
Lemon v. Kurtzman; Earley v. DiCenso (1971) 143
Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free School District (1993) 159
Edwards v. Aguillard (1987) 164

County of Allegheny v. ACLU (1989) 171
School District of Abington Township v. Schempp (1963) 179
Wallace v. Jaffree (1985) 185
Lee v. Weisman (1992) 192
READINGS 202

4. FREEDOM OF SPEECH, ASSEMBLY, AND ASSOCIATION 203
The Development of Legal Standards:
The Emergence of Law in Times of Crisis 204
Schenck v. United States (1919) 208
Abrams v. United States (1919) 210
Gitlow v. New York (1925) 215
Dennis v. United States (1951) 226
Brandenburg v. Ohio (1969) 234
Regulating Expression: Content and Contexts 237
United States v. O'Brien (1968) 241
Tinker v. Des Moines (1969) 245
Texas v. Johnson (1989) 250
Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire (1942) 256
Edwards v. South Carolina (1963) 259
Adderley v. Florida (1966) 262
Cohen v. California (1971) 267
Madsen v. Women's Health Center, Inc. (1994) 272
R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, Minnesota (1992) 280
Wisconsin v. Mitchell (1993) 285
West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette (1943) 289
Bigelow v. Virginia (1975) 294
Bates v. State Bar of Arizona (1977) 298
City of Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc. (1993) 306
READINGS 311

5. FREEDOM OF THE PRESS 313
Prior Restraint 314
Near v. Minnesota (1931) 315
New York Times v. United States (1971) 320
Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier (1988) 330
Government Control of Press Content 334
Simon & Schuster, Inc. v. Members of the New York State Crime Victims Board (1991) 335
Miami Herald v. Tornillo (1974) 338
Red Lion Broadcasting v. FCC (1969) 341
The Media and Special Rights 345
Branzburg v. Hayes (1972) 346
READINGS 352

6. THE BOUNDARIES OF FREE EXPRESSION: OBSCENITY AND LIBEL 353
Obscenity 353
Roth v. United States (1957) 356
Miller v. California (1973) 362
New York v. Ferber (1982) 368
Libel 378
New York Times v. Sullivan (1964) 379
Gertz v. Welch (1974) 390
Hustler Magazine v. Falwell (1988) 395
Masson v. New Yorker Magazine (1991) 399
READINGS 404

7. THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY 405
The Right to Privacy: Foundations 406
Griswold v. Connecticut (1965) 409
Private Activities and the Application of *Griswold* 415
Stanley v. Georgia (1969) 416
Bowers v. Hardwick (1986) 417
Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health (1990) 423
Reproductive Freedom and the Right to Privacy: Abortion 431
Roe v. Wade (1973) 433
Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health (1983) 451
Webster v. Reproductive Health Services (1989) 463
Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey (1992) 471
READINGS 484

III THE RIGHTS OF THE CRIMINALLY ACCUSED

The Criminal Justice System and Constitutional Rights 487
Overview of the Criminal Justice System 488
Trends in Court Decision Making 490

8. INVESTIGATIONS AND EVIDENCE 493
The Fourth Amendment: Historical Notes 494
The Supreme Court and the Fourth Amendment 495
Illinois v. Gates (1983) 496
Katz v. United States (1967) 502
Chimel v. California (1969) 507
Cupp v. Murphy (1973) 513
National Treasury Employees Union v. Von Raab (1989) 516
Terry v. Ohio (1968) 522
United States v. Ross (1982) 529
Enforcing the Fourth Amendment: The Exclusionary Rule 536
Mapp v. Ohio (1961) 538
United States v. Leon (1984) 547
The Fifth Amendment and Self-Incrimination 554
Escobedo v. Illinois (1964) 556
Miranda v. Arizona (1966) 558
Berkemer v. McCarty (1984) 569
Rhode Island v. Innis (1980) 573
READINGS 580

9. ATTORNEYS, TRIALS, AND PUNISHMENTS 581
The Right to Counsel 581
Powell v. Alabama (1932) 582
Gideon v. Wainwright (1963) 585
The Pretrial Period and the Right to Bail 591
United States v. Salerno (1987) 591
The Sixth Amendment and Fair Trials 595
Batson v. Kentucky (1986) 598
Sheppard v. Maxwell (1966) 606
Richmond Newspapers v. Virginia (1980) 612
Trial Proceedings 615
Maryland v. Craig (1990) 616
Final Trial Stage: An Overview of Sentencing 619
The Eighth Amendment 621
Gregg v. Georgia (1976) 623
McCleskey v. Kemp (1987) 634
Post-Trial Stages 641
Ashe v. Swenson (1970) 642
READINGS 644

IV CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil Rights and the Constitution 647
The Constitution and the Concept of Equality 647
The Supreme Court and Equal Protection of the Laws 649
Congressional Enforcement of Civil Rights 653

10. DISCRIMINATION 657
Racial Discrimination 657
Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) 658
Sweatt v. Painter (1950) 665
Brown v. Board of Education (1954) 669
Loving v. Virginia (1967) 672
Palmore v. Sidoti (1984) 674
Washington v. Davis (1976) 676
Shelley v. Kraemer (1948) 679
Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority (1961) 682
Moose Lodge #107 v. Irvis (1972) 685
Sex Discrimination 687
Reed v. Reed (1971) 690
Frontiero v. Richardson (1973) 692
Craig v. Boren (1976) 695
Michael M. v. Superior Court of Sonoma County (1981) 700
Rostker v. Goldberg (1981) 703
Orr v. Orr (1979) 705
Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan (1982) 707

Economic Discrimination 712
Shapiro v. Thompson (1969) 712
San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez (1973) 715
Alien Discrimination 721
Foley v. Connelie (1978) 721
Plyler v. Doe (1982) 724
Discrimination Remedies 728
Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenberg Board of Education (1971) 730
United States v. Fordice (1992) 736
Roberts v. United States Jaycees (1984) 742
Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978) 747
Johnson v. Transportation Agency of Santa Clara County, California (1987) 754
City of Richmond v. J. A. Croson Co. (1989) 759
Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC (1990) 764
Contemporary Developments in Discrimination Law 769
READINGS 773

11. VOTING AND REPRESENTATION 775
Voting Rights 775
Smith v. Allwright (1944) 780
Louisiana v. United States (1965) 783
South Carolina v. Katzenbach (1965) 787
Kramer v. Union Free School District (1969) 790
Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections (1966) 793
Dunn v. Blumstein (1972) 796
Political Representation 798
Baker v. Carr (1962) 802
Wesberry v. Sanders (1964) 804
Reynolds v. Sims (1964) 808
Karcher v. Daggett (1983) 815
Mahan v. Howell (1973) 818
United Jewish Organizations of Williamsburgh v. Carey (1977) 822
Shaw v. Reno (1993) 827
Davis v. Bandemer (1986) 833
READINGS 836

REFERENCE MATERIAL

Constitution of the United States 839
U.S. Presidents 849
Thumbnail Sketch of the Supreme Court's History 851
The Justices 853
Natural Courts 859
The American Legal System 865
The Processing of Cases 866
Supreme Court Calendar 867
Briefing Supreme Court Cases 868
Glossary 870

Subject Index 875
Case Index 891
Illustration Credits 899

TABLES, FIGURES, AND BOXES

TABLES

I-1 The Ratification of the Constitution 4
I-2 The Ratification of the Bill of Rights 6
I-3 Methods of Amending the Constitution 7
1-1 Precedents Overruled, 1953–1990 Terms 21
1-2 Liberal Voting of the Chief Justices, 1953–1991 26
1-3 Votes in Support of and Opposition to Decisions Declaring Legislation Unconstitutional, 1953–1991 Terms 28
1-4 Success Rate of the Solicitor General as an Amicus Curiae, by President, 1952–1990 Terms 35
1-5 Amici Curiae in *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services* by Two Group Types 39
1-6 Justices' Citations to Amicus Curiae Briefs, 1953–1991 Terms 40
2-1 Cases Incorporating Provisions of the Bill of Rights into the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment 59
3-1 The Aftermath of Select Court Cases Rejecting Free Exercise Claims 127
3-2 Major Religious Establishment Cases from *Everson* Through the Warren Court 139
3-3 Religious Establishment Standards Advocated by Members of the Supreme Court, 1971–1993 150
3-4 Aid to Religious Schools: Supreme Court Cases, 1947–1994 152
3-5 Variations in Incidence of Bible Reading in Public School by Region, 1960 and 1966 178
4-1 Personnel Changes: *Dennis* to *Yates* 233
4-2 Summary of Legal Standards Governing Free Speech 237
4-3 Public Forum Cases Decided by the Rehnquist Court 271
6-1 *Roth* and *Miller*, Compared 366
7-1 The *Griswold* Splits 414
7-2 The *Roe v. Wade* Trimester Scheme 444
7-3 Cases Involving Consent to Abortions, 1976–1993 448
7-4 Cases Involving Restrictions on Abortions 450
7-5 Diminishing Support for *Roe v. Wade:* The Supreme Court at the Time of *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services* 462
7-6 Approaches to Abortion: The 1994–1995 Supreme Court 483
8-1 Court Coalitions in Three Exclusionary Rule Cases 555
9-1 Comparison of the Development of the Exclusionary Rule and the Right to Counsel for Indigents 589
9-2 Capital Punishment in the United States 632
IV-1 Equal Protection Tests 652
10-1 Court Division on Equal Protection Standards in Sex Discrimination Cases 699
10-2 Admissions Data for the Entering Class of the Medical School of the University of California at Davis, 1973 and 1974 749

11-1 Percentage of Eligible Blacks Registered to Vote, Selected Years 1940–1984 789
11-2 Congressional Malapportionment, 1964 805

FIGURES

1-1 Left-Right Continuum of Justices Serving Between 1939 and 1941 25
1-2 Court Decisions on Economics and Civil Liberties Cases, 1953–1991 Terms 27
1-3 Provisions of Federal, State, and Local Laws and Ordinances Held Unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, 1789–1992 29
1-4 The Supreme Court and Public Opinion 33
1-5 The Percentage of the Supreme Court's Full Opinion Cases Containing At Least One Amicus Curiae Brief, 1953–1990 Terms 37
II-1 The Supreme Court's Support for First Amendment Claims, 1953–1991 Terms 70
II-2 Percentage of Agenda Space Allocated to Substantive Rights Cases, 1933–1992 Terms 71
3-1 Free Exercise Approaches Advocated by the Justices in *Smith, Lukumi Babalu,* and Beyond 126
3-2 Approval of Supreme Court Decision Preventing Organized Prayer in School 183
7-1 Percentage of Respondents Supporting an Individual's Right to Die 422
7-2 Legislative Action on Abortion Through the Early 1970s 432
7-3 Percentage of Respondents Supporting *Roe v. Wade,* 1974–1991 446
III-1 The American Criminal Justice System 488
III-2 Percentage of Supreme Court Criminal Rights Cases Decided in Favor of the Accused, 1953–1991 492
8-1 Public Opinion on Court Treatment of Criminals and on Wiretapping 501
9-1 Support for Capital Punishment 631

BOXES

I-1 Amendments Proposed by Congress but Rejected by the States 8
I-2 Four Amendments that Overturned Supreme Court Decisions 10
1-1 Hugo Lafayette Black 17
1-2 Amicus Curiae Participation 38
3-1 The Jehovah's Witnesses 80
3-2 What Did Madison, Jefferson, and the Other Founders Want? 129
3-3 Clashing Interests in the Courts: Separationist v. Accommodationist Interest Groups in Religious Establishment Litigation 141
3-4 The Roots of the *Lemon* Test 148
3-5 The Scopes Monkey Trial 163
4-1 Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. 214
4-2 The American Civil Liberties Union 220
4-3 Hate Speech and the Civil Liberties Community 283
5-1 Censored High School Newspaper Article 331
6-1 William Joseph Brennan, Jr. 354
6-2 *Roth, Jabobellis,* and *Memoirs,* Compared 359
6-3 What Is Obscene? 361
6-4 Obscenity and Feminism 373
6-5 Recording Industry's Warning Label 376
7-1 Living Wills 430
7-2 Why Were *Roe* and *Doe* Reargued? 434
7-3 Harry Andrew Blackmun 445
7-4 Proposed Approaches to Restrictive Abortion Laws 460
III-1 Warren Earl Burger 491
8-1 Arrest and Arrest Warrants 507
8-2 Debate over the Exclusionary Rule 545
8-3 African Queen Story 578
9-1 A Summary of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines 620
9-2 Justices Blackmun and Scalia on the Death Penalty 640
IV-1 The Civil War Amendments 649
IV-2 Major Civil Rights Acts 655
10-1 Thurgood Marshall 664
10-2 Earl Warren 668
10-3 One Child's Simple Justice 669
10-4 Ruth Bader Ginsburg 689
10-5 Affirmative Action/Minority Set-Aside Principles 768
10-6 Interpreting Civil Rights Statutes: The Case of Sexual Harassment 772

PART I

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE RIGHTS OF AMERICANS

THE LIVING CONSTITUTION

1. APPROACHES TO SUPREME COURT DECISION MAKING

2. INCORPORATION OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

PART I
THE LIVING CONSTITUTION

IN MAY 1787 the Founders of our nation met in Philadelphia "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation," but within a month they dramatically altered their mission. Viewing the articles as unworkable, they decided to start afresh. What emerged just four months later, on September 17, was an entirely new government scheme embodied in the U.S. Constitution.

The Framers were quite pleased with their handiwork, so much so that after they completed it, they "adjourned to City Tavern, dined together and took cordial leave of each other."[1] Most of the delegates were ready to go home after the long, hot summer in Philadelphia. And they did so, confident that the new document would receive speedy passage by the states. At first, it appeared as if their optimism was justified. As Table 1-1 depicts, before the year was out four states had ratified the Constitution—three by unanimous votes. But after January 1788, "the pace . . . slowed considerably."[2] By this time, a movement opposed to ratification was growing and marshaling arguments to deter state convention delegates. Most of all, these opponents, the so-called Anti-Federalists, feared the Constitution's new balance of power. They believed that strong state governments provided the only "sure defense of their liberties against a potentially tyrannical central authority," and that the Constitution tipped the scales in favor of federal power.[3] These fears were countered by the Federalists, who favored passage of the Constitution. Although their arguments and writings took many forms, among the most important was a series of eighty-five articles published in New York newspapers, under the pen name Publius. Written by John Jay, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton, *The Federalist Papers* continues to provide insight into the objectives and intent of the Founders.

Debates between the Federalists and their opponents often were highly philosophical in tone, with emphasis on the appropriate roles and powers of national institutions. In the states, however, ratification drives were full of the stuff of ordinary politics. Massachusetts provides a case in point. According to one account, the following events transpired there:

> Of the 355 delegates, 60 percent or more probably came to Boston on January 9 opposed. If the Federalists were to have any chance at all, they would need the hearty support of Samuel Adams, their already legendary Revolutionary

1. *1787,* compiled by historians of the Independence National Historical Park (New York: Exeter Books, 1987), 191.

2. Daniel A. Farber and Suzanna Sherry, *A History of the American Constitution* (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing, 1990), 177.

3. Melvin I. Urofsky, *A March of Liberty* (New York: Knopf, 1988), 96–98.

TABLE 1-1 The Ratification of the Constitution

State	*Date of Action*	*Decision*	*Margin*
Delaware	December 7, 1787	ratified	30:0
Pennsylvania	December 12, 1787	ratified	46:23
New Jersey	December 18, 1787	ratified	38:0
Georgia	December 31, 1787	ratified	26:0
Connecticut	January 8, 1788	ratified	128:40
Massachusetts	February 6, 1788	ratified with amendments	187:168
Maryland	April 26, 1788	ratified	63:11
South Carolina	May 23, 1788	ratified with amendments	149:73
New Hampshire	June 21, 1788	ratified with amendments	57:47
Virginia	June 25, 1788	ratified with amendments	89:79
New York	July 26, 1788	ratified with amendments	30:27
North Carolina	August 2, 1788	rejected	184:84
	November 21, 1789	ratified with amendments	194:77
Rhode Island	May 29, 1790	ratified with amendments	34:32

SOURCE: Daniel A. Farber and Suzanna Sherry, *A History of the American Constitution* (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing, 1990), 216.

hero, and of governor John Hancock, of Declaration immortality. Adams was tepid; Hancock, aloof and cool, preferring to wait and see which way the political tides might flow.

After three weeks of heated debate a delegation headed by Adams climbed Beacon Hill to knock on the door of the wealthy and gouty Hancock. They proposed that the governor declare for ratification on condition that a series of amendments be tacked on for the consideration of the Congress.

The price for Hancock's support? The presidency, if Virginia failed to ratify or if Washington declined to serve. Otherwise, the vice presidency or, some say, the promise of Bowdoin's support in the next governor's race.

Hancock agreed to the bribe and, his feet swathed in bandages, was carried theatrically to the rostrum to make his "Conciliatory Proposition" as though it were his own brainchild. Adams, still the darling of both sides, seconded the resolution to consider the amendments, and a few days later added several of his own.

The Constitution carried on February 6, 187 to 168, making Massachusetts the sixth state to ratify.[4]

This compromise, the call for a bill of rights, caught on. As one scholar noted, "It worked so well that Madison now advocated its use wherever the vote promised to be close."[5] As it turned out, he and other Federalists needed to do so quite often: as Table 1-1 indicates, of the nine states ratifying after January 1788, sev-en recommended that the new Congress consider amendments. Indeed, New York and Virginia probably would not have agreed to the Constitution without such an addition; Virginia actually called for a second constitutional convention for that purpose. Other states began devising their own wish lists—enumerations of specific rights they wanted put into the document.

Why were states so reluctant to ratify the Constitution without a bill of rights? Some viewed the new government scheme with downright suspicion, bemoaning "the great and extensive powers granted to the new government over the lives, liberties, and property of every citizen."[6] But more tended to agree with Thomas Jefferson's sentiment expressed in a letter to Madison:

4. J. T. Keenan, *The Constitution of the United States: An Unfolding Story*, 2d ed. (Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1988), 32–33.

5. Alpheus T. Mason, *The States Rights Debate*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 92–93.

6. Address of the Albany Antifederal Committee, April 26, 1788, quoted in Farber and Sherry, *American Constitution*, 180.