CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, MORAL CONTROVERSY,
AND THE SUPREME COURT

In *Constitutional Rights, Moral Controversy, and the Supreme Court*, Michael J. Perry examines three of the most disputed constitutional issues of our time: capital punishment, state laws banning abortion, and state policies denying the benefit of law to same-sex unions.

Perry, a leading constitutional scholar, explains that if a majority of the justices of the Supreme Court believes that a law violates the Constitution, it does not necessarily follow that the Court should rule that the law is unconstitutional. In cases in which it is argued that a law violates the Constitution, the Supreme Court must decide which of two importantly different questions it should address: (1) Is the challenged law unconstitutional? (2) Is the lawmakers’ judgment that the challenged law is constitutional a reasonable judgment? (One can answer both questions in the affirmative.)

By focusing on the death penalty, abortion, and same-sex unions, Perry provides new perspectives not only on moral controversies that implicate one or more constitutionally entrenched human rights, but also on the fundamental question of the Supreme Court’s proper role in adjudicating such controversies.

Michael J. Perry holds a Robert W. Woodruff Chair at Emory University, where he teaches in the law school. Previously, he held the Howard J. Trienens Chair in Law at Northwestern University, where he taught for fifteen years, and the University Distinguished Chair in Law at Wake Forest University. Perry has written on American constitutional law and theory; law, morality, and religion; and human rights theory in more than sixty articles and ten books, most recently *Under God? Religious Faith and Liberal Democracy* (Cambridge, 2003) and *Toward a Theory of Human Rights: Religion, Law, Courts* (Cambridge, 2007).
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