

Constitutionalism

American Constitutionalism

Jiří Baroš

 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1</t

American Constitutionalism

History

Constitutional Interpretation

 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1</t

American Constitutionalism



Constitutional Interpretation

0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	0		0		0		0		0		0		
0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	0		0		0		0		0		0		
0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	0		0		0		0		0		0		
0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	0		0		0		0		0		0		

www.muni.cz



Origins

Development

 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I

0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	0		0		0		0		0		0		
0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	0		0		0		0		0		0		
0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	0		0		0		0		0		0		
0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	0		0		0		0		0		$^{\circ}$		

www.muni.cz





Development

 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I

0		0		0		0		0		0		0
	0		0		0		0		0		0	
0		0		0		0		0		0		0
	0		0		0		0		0		0	
0		0		0		0		0		0		0
	0		0		0		0		0		0	
0		0		0		0		0		0		0
	\bigcirc											
		_		_		_		-				-

www.muni.cz



Federalist 78

Marbury v. Madison

 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0

Federalist 78

The Constitution and Ordinary Law

- Will of the People v. Constitutionally Delegated Authority
- Where to Place Final Authority to Interpret the Constitution (President? Parliament? Court?)

Federalist 78

- The Least Dangerous Branch ("Lacking Both Purse and Sword")
- Against Majority, and Public Opinion
- What If The Court Abuses Power?



- Republicans v. Federalists
- Adams signed Marbury's commission, but it was not delivered. Jefferson refused to deliver it.
- Marbury asked the Supreme Court to issue a writ of mandamus.



- Marbury had a legal right to the commission...
- Marbury had a legal remedy to it...
- The power to issue the writ of mandamus: statute and Constitution

Marbury v. Madison

 "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."

The Statute Was Unconstitutional...

0 0	0		0		0		0		0		0
		0		0		0		0		0	
0 🗆	0		0		0		0		0		0
		0		0		0		0		0	
0 🗆	0		0		0		0		0		0
		0		0		0		0		0	
0 🗆	0		0		0		0		0		0
		0		0		0		0		0	
ОП											

www.muni.cz



Origins

Development

 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0

 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0

Development

Dred Scott v. Sandford:

- Two Lawsuits (1846, 1853)
- Taney: "Any person descended from Africans, whether slave or free, is not a citizen of the United States."
- Missouri compromise ("Once free, always free.") voided.

 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0

Development

Lochner Era:

 using its interpretation of substantive due process to strike down laws held to be infringing on economic liberty or private contract rights.

 legislative proposal to enlarge the Court (Roosevelt)

 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I
 0
 I

 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0

Development

 Warren court: banned the segregation of public schools, expanded civil rights, judicial power, and the federal power

Burger court: continued the liberal legacy

 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0

Development

Rehnquist Court: more conservative (swing vote: Sandra O'Connor)

 Roberts court: still more conservative (swing vote Anthony Kennedy), but Obergefell v. Hodge (a right of same-sex couples to marry)

 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0

American Constitutionalism

History

Constitutional Interpretation

 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0

Constitutional Interpretation

Dworkin v. Rehnquist

Approaches

 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0

 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1

 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1

 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1
 0
 1

Constitutional Interpretation

Dworkin v. Rehnquist

Approaches

0

MASARYKOVA UNIVERZITA

Dworkin v. Rehnquist

- Rehnquist
- Dworkin

0 1 0

MASARYKOVA UNIVERZITA

Dworkin v. Rehnquist

Rehnquist

Dworkin





- Should the Constitution Be Responsive to Changing Social Conditions?
- Its Application Should be Coextensive with the Language
- Intention of the Constitution's Framers
- Constitution Becomes Increasingly Irrelevant

0 1 0

MASARYKOVA UNIVERZITA

Dworkin v. Rehnquist

Rehnquist

Dworkin

 Image: Constraint of the state of the s

Dworkin

- changes of interpretation of Constitution's text
- distinction between concept and conceptions
- fusion of constitutional law and philosophy
- the possibility of moral truth

 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0
 0

Constitutional Interpretation

Dworkin v. Rehnquist

Approaches

MASARYKOVA UNIVERZITA



- Textualism Consensualism
- Abstract Originalism (Philosophical Approach) -Intentionalism and Originalism
- Structuralism Doctrinalism Pragmatism



- Ackerman, B., We the People
- Barber, S., Fleming, J., Constitutional Intepretation
- Bickel, A., The Least Dangerous Branch
- Breyer, S., Making Our Democracy Work
- Chemerinsky, E., Constitutional Law
- Dworkin, R., Taking Rights Seriously
- Scalia, A., A Matter of Interpretation