

## Index

- absence of law, 127–132  
*Adair v. United States*, 94  
*Adkins v. Children's Hospital of DC*, 10, 93, 94, 96  
 Affordable Care Act, 133  
 allegory of tropes, 86  
 American Psychiatric Association (APA), 59, 65, 71  
 American Psychological Association, 8, 70  
 American Public Health Association, 65  
*Animal Farm* (Orwell), 14  
 “anti-canonical” cases, 89, 90–91  
 anti-caste principle, 12  
 anti-essentialists, 102  
 anti-family otherness rhetoric, 68  
 antibureaucratic reading, 83  
 antidiscrimination law, 7, 32  
 Antieau, Chester James, 17  
 antigay rights activists, 55, 60, 62–64  
 antihumanist aesthetic practice, 85  
 apartheid in South Africa, 54  
 Aristotlean tradition of rhetoric, 4–5  
 Arthur, John, 78–82  
 Ashcroft, John, 136–138  
*Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 136–138  
 Askew, Nancy, 114  
 attorneys’ arguments, *In re Davis*, 120–121
- Balkin, Jack, 90  
 Barker, Robert, 114, 115–116  
 Baron, Jane, 84  
 Ben-Yishai, Ayelet, 87  
 Berger, Linda, 87, 132  
 Best, Stephen, 87–88  
 Bickel, Alexander, 47  
 Billig, Michael, 101, 102, 103, 105–107, 109–110, 125  
 Black Civil Rights Movement, 61  
 Blackstone, William, 66  
 Blake, Robert, 63  
*Bond v. United States*, 96
- Boutelier v. INS*, 60  
*Bowers v. Hardwick*, 8, 64–66, 70, 71  
*Bowsher v. Synar*, 96  
*Briggs v. Elliot*, 6, 18–19  
 Brown, Gwen, 108  
 Brown, Henry B., 13, 21  
 Brown, Paul, 68  
*Brown v. Board of Education*  
   anti-canons, 90  
   defiance of, 33, 34–36, 38  
   denouncing legitimacy of, 52  
   enforcement pressures, 37  
   introduction, 7, 13  
   rhetoric of, 80  
 Bryant, Anita, 63–64  
*Bunting v. Oregon*, 94  
 Burke, Edmund, 27  
 Burke, Kenneth, 56
- Calhoun, John C., 23  
 Catholic Medical Association, 71  
 Chauncey, George, 60, 69  
 Christian Medical and Dental Associations, 71  
*Citizens United* decision, 128  
 civil disobedience, 7, 32, 36–39, 47, 50–51, 53  
 civil rights activists, 7, 32, 33, 36–39, 42, 51  
 civil rights era. *see* judicial process in civil rights era  
 “the civilizing hand of the law,” 130  
 Clark, Tom, 41  
*Clinton v. City of New York*, 96  
 collateral bar rule, 39, 44–47  
 Colorado Civil Commission, 67–69  
 Colorado for Family Values (CFV), 67–68  
 Commager, Henry Steele, 15, 19  
 Committee of Law Teachers Against Segregation  
   in Legal Education, 6, 16  
 Connor, Eugene ‘Bull,’ 40

- Constable, Marianne, 5  
 constitutional freedom, 42  
 Cooper, Charles, 73–74  
*Cooper v. Aaron*, 7, 33, 42–43, 46–47  
*Coppage v. Kansas*, 94  
 Correia, Martina, 114, 117–118  
 Cover, Robert, 2, 48, 100  
*Cox v. Louisiana*, 48
- Dade County ordinance, 62–64  
*Dames & Moore v. Regan*, 95  
 Davis, John W., 18  
 Davis, Kimberly Shawn, 114  
 Davis, Troy, 102. *see also In re Davis*  
 Davis, Virginia, 114, 115–117  
 de facto law, 35  
 death penalty lawyers, 113  
 DeBoer, April, 78, 81  
 Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), 74–78  
 defense witnesses, 114–115, 122  
 desegregation. *see also Brown v. Board of Education*; segregation  
   court opinions/decisions on, 8, 42, 46, 48  
   enforcement of, 37  
   “equality before the law” and, 29  
   introduction, 7  
   resistance to, 33, 34, 37, 41  
*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-I)*, 59  
 dialogic rhetoric, 10–11, 106, 107–110, 125  
 Dobson, Lou, 67  
 Douglass, Frederick, 6, 29  
 Dowling, Noel T., 15, 16  
*Dred Scott* opinion, 91  
 Dubofsky, Jean, 68  
 Due Process Clause, 128
- Eisenhower, Dwight D., 59  
 English Bill of Rights (1689), 23  
 epistemological dimension of tropes, 86–87  
 Equal Protection clause. *see also Fourteenth Amendment*  
   gay rights, 69  
   historical meaning, 18–19, 42, 50  
   introduction, 13  
   violations of, 39  
 “equality before the law”  
   argument in favor of, 14, 24–25, 131  
   introduction, 6  
   before *Roberts v. Boston*, 26–30  
   segregation and, 29–30  
 Establishment Clause, 129  
 Evans, Richard, 68  
*Ex parte Grossman*, 95
- extra-linguistic generalization, 85  
 extra-textual phenomenon, 91
- fact-plus-outcome, 134  
 Falligant, Robert, 114  
 Family Research Council, 67, 79  
 feminist rhetoric, 102–104  
 Ferguson, Robert, 50  
 Fifth Amendment, 94  
 First Amendment  
   protections, 46, 49  
   public demonstrations, 50  
   violations of, 39, 40, 41  
 Fish, Stanley, 2  
 Foss, Sonja, 101, 102, 103, 104–105  
 Foundation for Moral Law, 79  
 Fourteenth Amendment. *see also Equal Protection clause*  
   history of background, 16–17  
   introduction, 6, 13, 30  
   meaning of, 22, 35  
   object of, 21  
 Fowler, James, 91–92  
 Frank, John P., 17  
*Free Enterprise Fund*, 96  
 French Constitution (1791), 23  
*Freytag v. Commissioner*, 96
- Garner, Tyron, 69–72  
 Gay Liberation Front, 61  
 Gay Pride demonstrations/parades, 61  
 gay rights  
   antigay rights activists, 55, 60, 62–64  
   backlash, 62–64  
   *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 64–66, 70, 71  
   conclusion, 82  
   *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 9, 72–74, 76  
   homosexual repression and, 8  
   introduction, 8–9, 54–57  
   *Lawrence v. Texas*, 69–72  
   lesbian rights, 58  
   before mid-nineteenth century, 57–60  
   *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 9, 74, 78–82  
   present day, 66  
   *Romer v. Evans*, 67–69, 76  
   Stonewall Inn riots, 61–62  
   *United States v. Windsor*, 56, 74–78  
 gay rights movement, 61–62, 66  
*Gibbons v. Ogden*, 97  
 grammar and tropes, 85  
*Graphs, Maps, and Trees* (Moretti), 88–89  
 Green, Bob, 63  
 Greenberg, Jack, 37  
 Greene, Jamal, 90–91, 96

- Greene, William Batchelder, 6, 29  
 Griffin, Cindy, 101, 102, 103, 104–105
- Hardwick, Michael, 64–66  
 Harlan, John Marshall, 22  
 Hill, Herbert, 37  
*Holden v. Hardy*, 94  
*Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 9, 72–74, 76  
 Hollywood's Production Code, 58  
 homosexual repression, 8  
 Hooker, Richard, 28  
*How Many Judges Does It Take To Make  
 a Supreme Court?* (Orth), 93
- In re Davis*  
 attorneys' arguments, 120–121  
 conclusion, 125–126  
 Correia, Martina, 114, 117–118  
 Davis, Virginia, testimony, 115–117  
 defense witnesses, 114–115  
 direct examination of Davis, 119–120  
 overview, 110–112  
 sentencing hearing, 112–114  
 sentencing phase, 114  
 setting sentencing hearing, 112–114  
 testimony of youngest children,  
 118–119
- In re Marriage Cases*, 72  
*INS v. Chadha*, 96  
 institutional rhetoric, 9–10  
 invitational rhetoric, 10, 104–105, 107–110,  
 122–123, 126
- Jeon, Sanjick, 91–92  
 Jewish Elders, debate, 110  
 judges-should-not-legislate critique, 135  
 judging notion, 83  
 judicial decision-making  
 desegregation, 8, 42, 46, 48  
 rhetoric of precedent, 83–89  
 taxonomy of, 136–138  
 judicial process in civil rights era  
 assessing pull of substance in rule of law,  
 47–50  
 challenges to, 33–34  
 civil disobedience, 36–39  
 collateral bar rule, 44  
*Cooper v. Aaron*, 42–43  
 judicial defense of, 51–53  
 overview, 31–33  
 taxonomy of judicial decision, 136–138  
 trans-substantive defense of, 44  
*Walker v. Birmingham*, 39–42  
 judicial rhetoric, 9–10, 133–136
- Kasper, John, 41  
 King, Martin Luther, Jr., 37–38, 80, 130
- Landman, Janet, 108, 109  
 Lawrence, John, 69–72  
*Lawrence v. Texas*, 9, 56, 69–72  
*The Legal Imagination* (White), 83–89  
 legal rhetoric, alternative conceptions. *see also*  
 rhetoric  
 dialogic rhetoric, 10–11, 106, 107–110, 125  
 feminism and rhetoric, 102–104  
 introduction, 100–102  
 invitation and dialogue, 102  
 invitational rhetoric, 104–105,  
 107–110  
 new rhetoric, 105–106  
 writing as thinking, 105–107
- lesbian rights, 58  
 Letter From Birmingham Jail (King), 37  
 Levinson, Sandy, 90  
 Levy, Leonard W., 13, 16, 19  
*Licenses Cases*, 97  
 linguistic indeterminacy, 2  
 literary codes, 86  
*Lochner v. NY*, 94, 95  
 Locke, John, 28  
 Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth, 27  
 Luban, David, 48
- MacPhail, Mark, 102  
 Malone, Dumas, 15  
 de Man, Paul, 10, 85–87  
*Marbury v. Madison*, 95  
 Marcus, Sharon, 87–88  
 Marshall, John, 128  
 Marshall, Thurgood, 6, 18–19, 37  
 masculine rhetoric, 103  
 Massachusetts Constitution, 23–25  
 “massive resistance” campaign, 34  
 material facts in *stare decisis*, 134  
*McCulloch v. Maryland*, 95  
 McNamara, Robert, 109  
 McPhail, Mark. *see In re Davis*  
*McPherson v. Blacker*, 95  
 Meyer, Linda, 125  
 Meyler, Bernadette, 131  
*mise en abîme*, 86  
*Mistretta v. United States*, 95  
 Moore, T. Justin, 19–20  
 Moretti, Franco, 88–89, 92–93  
 Morris, Robert, 12, 15  
 Motley, Baker, 16  
 Mueller, Robert, 136–138  
*Muller v. Oregon*, 94, 131–132

- Munro, Robert F., 17  
*Myers v. United States*, 95
- NAACP Annual Convention, 37  
 NAACP Legal Defense Fund, 13  
 “naked power,” 34  
*National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, 133  
*New Process Steel*, 95  
 new rhetoric, 105–106, 132  
 Nichols, George, 28  
 Nixon, Cheryl, 108, 109  
*NLRB v. Canning*, 10, 93, 96  
*Norris v. Boston*, 93  
*North Star* (Douglass), 6, 29
- Obama, Michelle, 108  
 Obergefell, James, 78–82  
*Obergefell v. Hodges*, 9, 56, 74, 78–82, 128  
 Orth, John, 93  
 Orwell, George, 14
- Passenger Cases*, 97  
*per curiam* reversal, 45  
 Peters, Julie, 84  
 Petre, Elizabeth, 107–108  
 Philips, Harlan B., 13  
 Pierce, Edward L., 27  
 Platonic tradition of rhetoric, 4  
*Plessy v. Ferguson*, 6, 12, 16, 20, 93  
*Pocket Veto Case*, 95  
 Power, Katherine, 108  
 precedents  
   canons and conversations, 89–93  
   conclusion, 99  
   judicial decision-making, 83–89  
   putting together of, 93–99, 98*f*  
 preeminence of the language of the law, 52  
 Prendergast, Christopher, 88  
*Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, 97  
 Primus, Richard, 90–91  
 public self-reflection, 52  
 pull of substance, 47
- ratio decidendi, 134  
 reading strategy, 83–89  
 Recess Appointments clause, 95  
 reconciliation in *stare decisis*, 134  
 result-based approach, 134–135  
 rhetoric. *see also* legal rhetoric  
   as absence of law, 127–132  
   anti-family otherness rhetoric, 68  
   Aristotelean tradition of rhetoric, 4–5  
   *Brown v. Board of Education*, 80  
   defined, 102  
   dialogic rhetoric, 106  
   as essence of law, 132–133  
   feminism and, 102–104  
   institutional rhetoric, 9–10  
   introduction, 1–11  
   invitational rhetoric, 10, 122–123, 126  
   judicial rhetoric, 9–10, 133–136  
   masculine rhetoric, 103  
   new rhetoric, 105–106, 132  
   overview, 127  
   Platonic tradition of rhetoric, 4  
   of precedent, 83–89  
   scourge rhetoric, 62–63  
   Socratic tradition of rhetoric, 4  
   special-rights rhetoric, 68  
   *stare decisis*, 89, 91, 133–136, 138–139  
   taxonomy of judicial decision, 136–138  
   visibility rhetoric, 61  
 rhetorics of equality, 22–26  
 Roberts, Benjamin Franklin, 27  
 Roberts, Sarah. *see Sarah C. Roberts v. the City of Boston*  
*Roberts v. Boston*  
   brief history, 13–21  
   “equality before the law” before, 26–30  
   historical impact of, 21–22  
   introduction, 6  
   rhetorics of equality, 22–26  
   “the civilizing hand of the law,” 130  
 Romer, Roy, 67–69  
*Romer v. Evans*, 8, 56, 67–69, 76  
 Romero, Angela, 68  
 Romney, Ann, 108  
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 23  
 Rowse, Jayne, 78, 81  
 “rule of law”  
   assessing pull of substance, 47–50  
   introduction, 7, 8  
   judicial process and, 32  
   *stare decisis* under, 135
- Sarah C. Roberts v. the City of Boston*, 12–13, 30  
 Save Our Children group, 63–64  
 Schmidt, Christopher, 130  
 scourge rhetoric, 62–63  
 segregation. *see also* desegregation; specific cases  
   defenders of, 51  
   early struggle over, 12  
   “equality before the law” and, 29–30  
   First Amendment violations, 41  
   introduction, 6  
   as unconstitutional, 131  
 sentencing hearings, 112–114

- “separate but equal” doctrine, 13, 14, 16, 20  
 sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), 71  
 Shaw, Lemuel, 13, 23–26. *see also* *Roberts v. Boston*  
 Slaughter, Eric, 12–13  
*Smith v. Turner*, 93  
 Socratic tradition of rhetoric, 4  
 Southern Manifesto, 7, 34–36  
 special-rights rhetoric, 68  
 Spyer, Thea, 74–78  
*stare decisis*, 89, 91, 133–136, 138–139  
*Stenberg v. Carhart*, 129  
 Stonewall Inn riots, 61–62  
 Story, Joseph, 128  
*Stuart v. Laird*, 95  
 Sumner, Charles, 12–13, 19, 23–25, 26, 131. *see also*  
 “equality before the law”; *Roberts v. Boston*  
 Sunstein, Cass, 92, 138  
 surface reading, 88  
*Sweatt v. Painter*, 6, 13, 16–17  
  
 taxonomy of judicial decision, 136–138  
 Texas Physicians Resource Council, 71  
 tropes and grammar, 85  
  
 U. S. Postal Service, 59  
*United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs*,  
 43, 51  
  
*United States v. Ballin*, 95  
*United States v. Windsor*, 56, 74–78  
 U.S. Supreme Court, 51, 69, 73. *see also* specific  
 cases  
*U.S. v. Midwest Oil*, 95  
*U.S. v. Windsor*, 9  
  
 visibility rhetoric, 61  
 Vrooman, Walter, 15  
  
*Walker v. Birmingham*  
   collateral bar rule, 44–46  
   fair administration of justice, 51  
   introduction, 7, 33  
   judicial process, 39–42  
*Walker v. City of Birmingham*, 130  
 Warren, Earl, 20  
 Wetlaufer, Gerald, 1, 50, 100–101  
 White, Boyd, 83–89  
 White, James Boyd, 4–5, 9  
*Wilson v. New*, 94  
 Windsor, Edith, 74–78  
 witness-agents, 123  
 writ of habeas corpus, 111  
 writing as thinking, 105–107  
  
*Youngstown Sheet*, 95