

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-83563-3 — US Supreme Court Doctrine in the State High Courts
Michael P. Fix , Benjamin J. Kassow
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

US SUPREME COURT DOCTRINE IN THE STATE HIGH COURTS

US Supreme Court Doctrine in the State High Courts challenges theoretical and empirical accounts about how state high courts use US Supreme Court doctrine and precedent. Michael P. Fix and Benjamin J. Kassow argue that theories that do not account for the full range of ways in which state high courts can act are, by definition, incomplete. Examining three important precedents – *Atkins v. Virginia*, *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, and *District of Columbia v. Heller/McDonald v. Chicago* – Fix and Kassow find that state high courts commonly ignore Supreme Court precedent for reasons of political ideology, path dependence, and fact patterns in cases that may be of varying similarity to those found in relevant US Supreme Court doctrine. This work, which provides an important addition to the scholarly literature on the impact of Supreme Court decisions, should be read by anyone interested in law and politics or traditional approaches to the study of legal decision-making.

Michael P. Fix is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at Georgia State University. His research focuses on the evolution of law and policy over time. His work has appeared in numerous political science journals and law reviews including *Political Research Quarterly*, *Social Science Quarterly*, *Vanderbilt Law Review*, and *Justice System Journal*.

Benjamin J. Kassow is Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at the University of North Dakota. His research focuses on how judges formulate opinions and the impact of judicial decisions, broadly defined. He has published articles in a variety of journals, including *Political Research Quarterly*, *American Politics Research*, and the *Journal of Law and Courts*.

US Supreme Court Doctrine in the State High Courts

MICHAEL P. FIX

Georgia State University

BENJAMIN J. KASSOW

University of North Dakota



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-83563-3 — US Supreme Court Doctrine in the State High Courts
Michael P. Fix, Benjamin J. Kassow
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India
79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108835633

DOI: 10.1017/9781108891141

© Michael P. Fix and Benjamin J. Kassow 2020

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2020

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ International Ltd. Padstow, Cornwall

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

NAMES: Fix, Michael P, 1980– author. | Kassow, Benjamin, author.

TITLE: US Supreme Court doctrine in the state high courts / Michael P. Fix,

Georgia State University; Benjamin J. Kassow, University of North Dakota

DESCRIPTION: New York : Cambridge University Press, 2020. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2020009495 (print) | LCCN 2020009496 (ebook) | ISBN 9781108835633 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108812979 (paperback) | ISBN 9781108891141 (epub)

SUBJECTS: LCSH: Courts of last resort–United States–States. | Judicial process–United States–States. | United States. Supreme Court–Influence. | Federal government–United States. | Stare decisis–United States.

CLASSIFICATION: LCC KF8736 .F59 2020 (print) | LCC KF8736 (ebook) | DDC 347.73/365–dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020009495>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020009496>

ISBN 978-1-108-83563-3 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-108-81297-9 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

In memory of Hubert and Betty Smith

M. P. F.

For all of the South Carolina public law alums
(past, present, and future)

B. J. K.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> xi
<i>List of Tables</i>	xiii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 A Tale of Three State Court Decisions	3
1.2 A New Theoretical Approach	6
1.3 A Road Map for the Book	9
2 The Role of Precedent: A Brief History	13
2.1 The Origins of <i>Stare Decisis</i>	13
2.1.1 The Earliest Systematic Court Records: Bracton and the Year Books	14
2.1.2 The Gradual Modernization of Case Reporting	16
2.1.3 Precedent and Case Reporting in the American Colonies and the Early Post-independence Period	19
2.2 The Adoption of the Strong View of Precedent in English and American Law	22
2.2.1 Toward an Absolute View of Precedent and Back Again: England in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries	22
2.2.2 The View of Precedent in the US Courts	25
2.3 Are State Courts Bound to US Supreme Court Decisions?	30
2.3.1 When State and Federal Questions Are Mixed	34
2.4 Conclusion	38

3	A Theory of State High Court Usage of US Supreme Court Precedent	39
3.1	Decision-Making on State High Courts	40
3.2	State High Courts and US Supreme Court Precedent	42
3.3	Core Assumptions	44
3.4	A Theory of Precedent Usage by State High Courts	48
3.5	From Federal Precedent to State Policy	55
4	Conceptualizing and Measuring How State High Courts Use US Supreme Court Opinions	57
4.1	Brief History of Compliance Studies in Terms of Measurement Theory	57
4.2	Newer Research Contributions: The Gift of <i>Shepard's Citations</i>	60
4.3	Our Measure of State High Court Responses to US Supreme Court Precedents	64
4.4	Descriptive Findings from Three Empirical Applications	68
5	State High Court Responses to <i>Atkins v. Virginia</i>: Characterized by Flexibility	71
5.1	A Brief History of Death Penalty Litigation: Post- <i>Gregg v. Georgia</i>	72
5.2	Intellectual Disability and the Eighth Amendment: Controversy and Resolution	73
5.3	How States Have Dealt with <i>Atkins</i>	76
5.4	Supreme Court Post- <i>Atkins</i>	82
5.5	Application of Our Theory to <i>Atkins</i>	83
5.6	Data and Methods	86
5.7	Results and Discussion	90
5.8	Concluding Thoughts	93
6	State High Court Usage of <i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i>: Examining a Case of Maximum Discretion	96
6.1	A Brief History of Establishment Clause Jurisprudence	98
6.2	<i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i> : A (Failed) Attempt at a Universal Standard	100
6.3	How States Have Dealt with <i>Lemon</i>	104
6.4	Application of Our General Theory to <i>Lemon</i>	109
6.5	Data and Methods	113
6.6	Results and Discussion	115
6.7	Concluding Thoughts	118

7	State High Court Usage of <i>District of Columbia v. Heller</i> and <i>McDonald v. City of Chicago</i>: Moderate Degrees of Flexibility	121
7.1	<i>Heller</i> and <i>McDonald</i> : Establishing a Second Amendment Constitutional “Floor”	122
7.2	A Brief History of Second Amendment Case Law	123
7.3	<i>Heller</i> and <i>McDonald</i> : Cases and Immediate Aftermath	126
7.4	Research Design and Method	128
7.4.1	General Trends in State Court Responses to <i>Heller</i> and <i>McDonald</i>	128
7.5	Case Studies in State High Court Reactions to <i>Heller</i> and <i>McDonald</i>	136
7.5.1	States’ Citations and Treatments of <i>Heller</i> Prior to <i>McDonald</i>	138
7.5.2	Massachusetts’ Treatments of <i>McDonald</i> and <i>Heller</i> Post- <i>McDonald</i>	140
7.5.3	Illinois’ Treatments of <i>Heller</i> and <i>McDonald</i>	146
7.5.4	The Louisiana Supreme Court’s Discussion of <i>Heller</i> and <i>McDonald</i>	149
7.6	Conclusion	153
8	Concluding Thoughts and Future Extensions	156
8.1	Purpose and General Findings of the Book	156
8.2	Case Selection Concerns	159
8.2.1	Additional Notes on Case Selection: <i>Alden v. Maine</i>	160
8.3	Summary of Specific Findings from Our Applications	161
8.3.1	Summary of Findings from <i>Atkins</i> Chapter	162
8.3.2	Summary of Findings from <i>Lemon</i> Chapter	163
8.3.3	Summary of Findings from Second Amendment Chapter	164
8.4	Implications of Our Book	165
8.5	Future Work	166
	<i>Bibliography</i>	169
	<i>Index</i>	179

Figures

5.1	Variation in state-specific vitality for <i>Atkins</i> (2017)	page 87
5.2	Variation in treatments of <i>Atkins</i> over time	88
5.3	Effects of severe mental illness claim	93
6.1	Variation in treatments of <i>Lemon</i> over time	105
6.2	Variation in state-specific vitality for <i>Lemon</i> (2017)	114
6.3	Effects of church suit on treatment type	118
7.1	Variation in state-specific vitality for <i>Heller</i> (2018)	131
7.2	Variation in treatments of <i>Heller</i> over time	132
7.3	Variation in state-specific vitality for <i>McDonald</i> (2018)	134
7.4	Variation in treatments of <i>McDonald</i> over time	135

Tables

5.1	Treatment patterns by state high court of <i>Atkins</i>	page 81
5.2	Determinants of treatment types for <i>Atkins</i>	91
6.1	Treatment patterns by state high court of <i>Lemon</i>	108
6.2	Determinants of treatment types for <i>Lemon</i>	116
7.1	Treatment patterns by state high court of <i>Heller</i>	130
7.2	Treatment patterns by state high court of <i>McDonald</i>	133

Table of Cases

- Abela v. General Motors Corp., 677 N.W.2d 325 (Mich. 2004)
 Abie State Bank v. Bryan, 282 U.S. 765 (1931)
 Abington Township v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963)
 AFT Michigan v. State, 866 N.W.2d 782 (Mich. 2015)
 Agostini v. Felton, 521 U.S. 203 (1997)
 Alden v. Maine, 527 U.S. 706 (1999)
 American Legion v. American Humanist Association, 139 S.Ct. 2067 (2019)
 Animal Science Products v. Hebei Welcome Pharmaceutical Co., 138 S.Ct. 1865 (2018)
 Arizona v. Evans, 514 U.S. 1 (1995)
 Arkansas Game & Fish Commission v. United States, 568 U.S. 23 (2012)
 Arnold v. Tennessee Board of Paroles, 956 S.W.2d 478 (Tenn. 1997)
 Atkins v. Virginia, 536 U.S. 304 (2002)
 Auer v. Robbins, 519 U.S. 452 (1997)
 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. v. Baugh, 149 U.S. 368 (1893)
 Beamish v. Beamish, 11 Eng. Rep. 735 (1861)
 Beauregard v. New Orleans, 59 U.S. 497 (1856)
 Black & White Taxicab & Transfer Co. v. Brown & Yellow Taxicab & Transfer Co., 276 U.S. 518 (1928)
 Board of County Commissioners of Muskogee County v. Lowery, 136 P.3d 639 (Okla. 2006)
 Board of Education v. Allen, 392 U.S. 236 (1968)
 Board of Education of Kiryas Joel Village School District v. Grumet, 512 U.S. 687 (1994)
 Bock v. Westminster Mall Co., 819 P.2d 55 (Colo. 1991)
 Bowling v. Commonwealth, 163 S.W. 3d 361 (Ky. 2005)
 Bradfield v. Roberts, 175 U.S. 291 (1899)

- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954)
 Burgess v. Seligman, 107 U.S. 20 (1882)
 Burnet v. Coronado Oil & Gas Company, 285 U.S. 393 (1932)
 Caetano v. Massachusetts, 136 S.Ct. 1027 (2016)
 Carnival Corp. v. Carlisle, 953 So. 2d 461 (Fla. 2007)
 CDA Dairy Queen, Inc. v. State Insurance Fund, 299 P.3d 186 (Idaho 2013)
 Central Virginia Community College v. Katz, 546 U.S. 356 (2006)
 Chardin v. Police Commissioner of Boston, 989 N.E.2d 392 (Mass. 2013)
 Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad Co. v. Martin, 283 U.S. 209 (1931)
 Chill v. Mississippi Hospital Reimbursement Committee, 429 So.2d 574 (Miss. 1983)
 Christy v. Pidgeon, 71 U.S. 196 (1866)
 City of Norwood v. Horney, 853 N.E.2d 1115 (Ohio 2006)
 Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264 (1821)
 Coker v. Georgia, 433 U.S. 584 (1977)
 Commonwealth v. Caetano, 26 N.E.3d 688 (Mass. 2015)
 Commonwealth v. Cass, 709 A.2d 350 (Pa. 1998)
 Commonwealth v. Depina, 922 N.E.2d 778 (2010)
 Commonwealth v. Gouse, 965 N.E.2d 774 (Mass. 2012)
 Commonwealth v. Loadholt, 923 N.E.2d 1037 (Mass. 2010)
 Commonwealth v. Loadholt II, 954 N.E.2d 1128 (Mass. 2011)
 Commonwealth v. McGowan, 982 N.E.2d 495 (Mass. 2013)
 Commonwealth v. Miller, 888 A.2d 624 (Pa. 2005)
 Commonwealth v. Powell, 946 N.E.2d 114 (Mass. 2011)
 Commonwealth v. Runyan, 922 N.E.2d 794 (Mass. 2010)
 Commonwealth v. Sanchez, 36 A.3d 24 (Pa. 2011)
 Commonwealth v. Sharpless, 2 Serg. & Rawle 91 (Pa. 1815)
 Commonwealth v. Upton, 476 N.E. 2d 548 (Mass. 1985)
 Commonwealth v. Wasson, 842 S.W.2d 487 (Ky. 1992)
 County of Allegheny v. ACLU, 492 U.S. 573 (1989)
 Cox v. GE Co., 85 S.E.2d 514 (Ga. 1955)
 Crowell v. Randell, 35 U.S. 368 (1836)
 Danner v. MBNA American Bank, 255 S.W.3d 863 (Ark. 2007)
 Day v. Chicago & N.W.R. Co., 188 N.E. 540 (Ill. 1933)
 Delaware v. Prouse, 440 U.S. 648 (1979)
 Detroit v. Osborne, 135 U.S. 492 (1890)
 District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008)
 Doe v. Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services, 62 A.3d 123 (Md. 2011)

- East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation v. California, 13 P.3d 1122 (Cal. 2000)
- Edwards v. Aguillard, 482 U.S. 578 (1987)
- Elk Grove Unied School District v. Newdow, 536 U.S. 639 (2002)
- Elmendorf v. Taylor, 23 U.S. 152 (1825)
- Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962)
- Enmund v. Florida, 458 U.S. 782 (1982)
- Enterprise Irrigation District v. Farmers Mutual Canal Co., 243 U.S. 157 (1917)
- Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64 (1938)
- Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 478 (1964)
- Eustis v. Bolles, 150 U.S. 361 (1893)
- Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947)
- Ex parte Briseno, 135 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. Crim. App. 2004)
- Ex parte Taylor, 2015 WL 5076811 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006)
- Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer, 427 U.S. 445 (1976)
- Flast v. Cohen, 392 U.S. 83 (1968)
- Fox Film Corp. v. Muller, 296 U.S. 207 (1935)
- Freshwater v. Mt. Vernon City School District, 1 N.E.3d 335 (2013)
- Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972)
- Gamble v. United States, 139 S.Ct. 1960 (2019)
- Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority, 469 U.S. 528 (1985)
- Giles v. Teasley, 193 U.S. 146 (1904)
- Gill v. Oliver's Executors, 52 U.S. 529 (1850)
- Godfrey v. Georgia, 446 U.S. 420 (1980)
- Goodin v. State, 102 So. 3d 1002 (Miss. 2012)
- Goodridge v. Department of Public Health, 798 N.E.2d 941 (Mass. 2003)
- Green v. Lessee of Neal, 31 U.S. 291 (1832)
- Greenwood v. California, 486 U.S. 35 (1988)
- Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153 (1976)
- Grimball v. Ross, Charlton's Reports (1805–1810), 175 (Liberty County Super. Ct. 1808)
- Grin v. Coughlin, 673 N.E.2d 98 (N.Y. 1996)
- Gryczan v. State, 942 P.2d 112 (Mont. 1997)
- Guarenty Trust Co. v. York, 326 U.S. 99 (1945)
- Hall v. Florida, 134 S.Ct. 1986 (2014)
- Hamilton v. Eaton, 1 N.C. 641 (N.C. 1796)
- Hein v. Freedom from Religion Foundation, Inc., 551 U.S. 587 (2007)
- Henderson v. Grin, 30 U.S. 151 (1831)
- Hertz v. Woodman, 218 U.S. 205 (1910)

- Hilen v. Hayes, 673 S.W.2d 713 (Ky. 1984)
 Hilton v. South Carolina Public Railways Commission, 502 U.S. 197 (1991)
 Horton v. Meskill, 376 A.2d 359 (Conn. 1977)
 Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 132 S.Ct. 694 (2012)
 Hough v. Railroad Co., 100 U.S. 213 (1880)
 Hunt v. McNair, 413 U.S. 734 (1973)
 Hunter v. Martin, 18 Va. 1 (Va. 1815)
 Illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213 (1983)
 In re N.G., 115 N.E.3d 102 (Ill. 2018)
 Indiana ex rel. Anderson v. Brand, 303 U.S. 95 (1938)
 Insurance Co. v. Treasurer, 78 U.S. 204 (1871)
 Jackson ex dem. St. John v. Chew, 25 U.S. 153 (1827)
 James v. City of Boise, Idaho, 136 S.Ct. 685 (2016)
 Johnson v. Williams, 568 U.S. 289 (2013)
 Jones v. Wheelis, 4 La. Ann. 541 (La. 1849)
 Katz v. United States, 389 U.S. 347 (1967)
 Kedro v. Saint Nicholas Cathedral of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America, 344 U.S. 94 (1952)
 Kennedy v. Louisiana, 554 U.S. 407 (2008)
 Kentucky State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education v. Rudasill, 589 S.W. 2d 877 (Ky. 1979)
 Kerlin's Lessee v. Bull, 1 Dall. 175 (Pa. 1786)
 Kerrigan v. Commissioner of Public Health, 957 A.2d 407 (Conn. 2008)
 Kimble v. Marvel Entertainment, LLC, 135 S.Ct. 2401 (2015)
 King v. Village of Waunakee, 517 N.W.2d 671 (Wis. 1994)
 Kisor v. Wilkie, 139 S.Ct. 2400 (2019)
 Klinger v. Missouri, 80 U.S. 257 (1871)
 Knauer v. Ministry of Justice, [2016] UKSC 9
 Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free School District, 508 U.S. 384 (1993)
 Landgraf v. USI Film Products, 511 U.S. 244 (1994)
 Le Roy v. Sedley, 1 Sid 168 (1663)
 Lee v. Weisman, 505 U.S. 577 (1992)
 Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602 (1971)
 Linn v. State Bank of Illinois, 2 Ill. 87 (Ill. 1833)
 London Tramways Company v. London County Council, [1898] AC 375
 Louisiana v. Pilsbury, 105 U.S. 278 (1881)
 Lynch v. Donnelly, 465 U.S. 668 (1984)

- Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1961)
 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1893)
 Martin v. Hunter's Lessee, 14 U.S. 304 (1816)
 Mather & Strong v. Bush, 16 Johns. 233 (N.Y. 1819)
 McCollum v. Board of Education, 333 U.S. 203 (1948)
 McCoy v. Shaw, 277 U.S. 302 (1928)
 McCreary County v. ACLU, 545 U.S. 844 (2005)
 McDonald v. Chicago, 561 U.S. 742 (2010)
 McDonald v. City of Chicago, 130 S.Ct. 3020 (2010)
 Mealey v. Martin, 468 P.2d 965 (Alaska 1970)
 Michigan v. Long, 463 U.S. 1032 (1983)
 Miller v. California, 413 U.S. 12 (1973)
 Minnesota Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, 649 N.W. 2d 426 (Minn. 2002)
 Minnesota v. National Tea Co., 309 U.S. 551 (1940)
 Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)
 Mitchell v. Helms, 530 U.S. 793 (2000)
 Montgomery County Fiscal Court v. Trimble, 104 Ky. 629 (Ky. 1898)
 Moore v. Madigan, 705 F.3d 933 (7th Cir. 2012)
 Moore v. Texas, 137 S.Ct. 1039 (2017)
 Morley v. Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Co., 146 U.S. 162 (1892)
 Morris v. Metriyakool, 344 N.W.2d 736 (Mich. 1984)
 Morse v. Frederick, 551 U.S. 393 (2007)
 Mullaney v. Wilbur, 421 U.S. 684 (1975)
 Murdock v. City of Memphis, 87 U.S. 590 (1875)
 Myrick v. Michigan Central Railroad Co., 107 U.S. 102 (1882)
 New York v. United States, 488 U.S. 1041 (1992)
 Nunn v. State, 1 Ga. 243 (Ga. 1846)
 Obergefell v. Hodges, 135 S.Ct. 2584 (2015)
 Oregon v. Hass, 420 U.S. 714 (1975)
 Owen v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 652 F.2d 1271 (6th Cir. 1981)
 Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, 551 U.S. 701 (2007)
 Patterson v. McLean Credit Union, 491 U.S. 164 (1989)
 Payne v. Tennessee, 501 U.S. 808 (1991)
 Penry v. Lynaugh, 492 U.S. 302 (1989)
 People v. Aguilar, 2 N.E.3d 321 (Ill. 2011)
 People v. Burns, 79 N.E.3d 159 (Ill. 2015)
 People v. Chairez, 104 N.E.3d 1158 (Ill. 2018)

- People v. Collins, 478 N.E.2d 267 (Ill. 1985)
 People v. Falbe, 727 N.E.2d 200 (Ill. 2000)
 People v. Hillman, 834 P.2d 1271 (Colo. 1992)
 People v. Johnson, 488 N.E.2d 439 (N.Y. 1985)
 People v. McFadden, 61 N.E.3d 74 (Ill. 2016)
 People v. McNeal, 677 N.E.2d 841 (Ill. 1997)
 Pfeil v. St. Matthews Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Unaltered Augsburg
 Confession of Worthington, 877 N.W.2d 528 (Minn. 2016)
 Polk's Lessee v. Wendal, 13 U.S. 87 (1815)
 Powell v. State, 510 S.E. 2d 18 (Ga. 1998)
 Presser v. Illinois, 116 U.S. 252 (1886)
 Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898 (1997)
 Propeller Genesee Chief v. Fitzhugh, 53 U.S. 443 (1852)
 Provident Institute for Savings v. Massachusetts, 73 U.S. 611 (1867)
 PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins, 447 U.S. 74 (1980)
 R. v. Curl, 2 Str. 788 (1727)
 Railroad Co. v. Lockwood, 84 U.S. 357 (1873)
 Railroad Co. v. Rock, 71 U.S. 177 (1867)
 Ramirez v. Commonwealth, 94 N.E.3d 809 (Mass. 2018)
 Randall v. Brigham, 74 U.S. 523 (1869)
 Ratliff v. Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., 680 S.E.2d 28 (W. Va. 2009)
 Reichman-Crosby Co. v. Stone, 37 So. 2d 22 (Miss. 1948)
 Reynolds v. United States, 98 U.S. 145 (1879)
 Richmond Medical Center v. Gilmore, 219 F.3d 376 (4th Cir. 2000)
 Rikard v. State, 123 S.W.3d 114 (Ark. 2003)
 Rivers v. Roadway Express, Inc., 511 U.S. 298 (1994)
 Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973)
 Roemer v. Board of Public Works of Maryland, 426 U.S. 736 (1976)
 Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551 (2005)
 Russell v. State, 849 So. 2d 95 (Miss. 2003)
 Salt Lake City v. Piepenburg, 571 P.2d 1299 (Utah 1977)
 Santa Fe Independent School District v. Doe, 530 U.S. 290 (2000)
 Save Our Cumberland Mountains, Inc. v. Hodel, 826 F.2d 43 (D.C. Cir. 1987)
 Schwartz v. Atlas Van Lines, Inc., 976 P.2d 145 (Wash. 1999)
 Sir Charles Sydlyess Case, 1 Keble 620 (1663)
 Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 517 U.S. 44 (1996)
 Shelby v. Guy, 24 U.S. 361 (1826)
 Shipp v. Miller's Heirs, 15 U.S. 316 (1817)
 Sims v. Georgia, 385 U.S. 538 (1967)

- Skelly Oil Co. v. Jackson, 148 P.2d 182 (Okla. 1944)
 Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649 (1944)
 Smith v. Maryland, 10 U.S. 286 (1810)
 Smith v. U.S., 508 U.S. 223, 1993
 Society of Separationists v. Whitehead, 870 P.2d 916 (Utah 1993)
 Sojourner v. Roemer, 772 F. Supp. 930 (E.D. La. 1991)
 South's Heirs v. Thomas' Heirs, 23 Ky. 59 (Ky. 1828)
 Square D Company v. Niagara Frontier Tari Bureau, 476 U.S. 409 (1986)
 State ex rel. J.M., 144 So.3d 853 (La. 2014)
 State ex rel. Bourque v. Cain, 876 So. 2d 744 (La. 2004)
 State v. Boland, 800 P.2d 1112 (Wash. 1990)
 State v. Cordova, 784 P.2d 30 (N.M. 1989)
 State v. Crane, 329 P.3d 689 (N.M. 2014)
 State v. Donato, 20 P.3d 5 (Idaho 2001)
 State v. Draughter, 130 So.3d 855 (La. 2013)
 State v. Eberhardt, 145 So.3d 377 (La. 2014)
 State v. Glass, 583 P.2d 872 (Alaska 1978)
 State v. Goss, 834 A.2d 316 (N.H. 2003)
 State v. Havlat, 385 N.W.2d 436 (Neb. 1986)
 State v. Hempele, 576 A.2d 793 (N.J. 1990)
 State v. Henry, 732 P.2d 9 (Ore. 1987)
 State v. Jackson, 688 P.2d 136 (Wash. 1984)
 State v. Jacumin, 778 S.W.2d 430 (Tenn. 1989)
 State v. Jones, 706 P.2d 317 (Alaska 1985)
 State v. Kimbro, 496 A.2d 498 (Conn. 1985)
 State v. Lien, 441 P.3d 185 (Ore. 2019)
 State v. McMurray, 860 N.W.2d 686 (Minn. 2015)
 State v. Moor, 1 Miss. 134 (Miss. 1823)
 State v. Morris, 680 A.2d 90 (Vt. 1996)
 State v. Rodrigues, 286 P.3d 809 (Haw. 2012)
 State v. Schultz, 850 P.2d 818 (Kan. 1993)
 State v. Schwartz, 689 N.W.2d 430 (S.D. 2004)
 State v. Sieyes, 225 P.3d 995 (Wash. 2010)
 State v. Trahan, 428 N.W.2d 619 (Neb. 1988)
 State v. Webb, 144 So.3d 971 (La. 2014)
 State v. Williams, No. 114-1505-06 (114th Dist. Ct. Tex. 2006)
 Suydam v. Williamson, 65 U.S. 427 (1861)
 Swift v. Tyson, 41 U.S. 1 (1842)
 Thatcher v. Powell, 19 U.S. 119 (1821)

- Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503 (1969)
Trimble v. Taub, 23 Ky. 455 (Ky. 1828)
United States v. Miller, 307 U.S. 174 (1939)
United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1876)
United States v. Ianniello, 808 F.2d 184 (2nd Cir. 1986)
United States v. Kennerley, 209 F. 119 (S.D.N.Y. 1913)
United States v. Scott, 437 U.S. 82 (1978)
Van Ness v. Pacard, 27 U.S. 137 (1829)
Van Orden v. Perry, 545 U.S. 677 (2005)
Varnum v. Brien, 763 N.W.2d 862 (Iowa 2009)
Vogel v. State, 426 So. 2d 882 (Ala. 1982)
Wainwright v. Goode, 464 U.S. 78 (1983)
Wallace v. Jaree, 472 U.S. 38 (1985)
Walz v. Tax Commission, 397 U.S. 664 (1970)
Ware v. Hylton, 3 U.S. 199 (1796)
Waring v. Jackson, 26 U.S. 570 (1828)
Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 679 (1872)
Williams v. Ashland Engineering Company, 45 F.3d 588 (1st Cir. 1995)
Wilson v. County of Cook, 968 N.E.2d 641 (Ill. 2012)
Witters v. Commission for the Blind, 771 P.2d 1119 (Wash. 1989)
Young v. Bristol Aeroplane Co. Ltd., [1944] KB 718
Youngbluth v. Youngbluth, 6 A. 3d 677 (Vt. 2010)
Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co., 433 U.S. 562 (1977)
Zahn's Executor v. State Tax Commission, 47 S.W.2d 925 (Ky. 1932)
Zelman v. Simmons-Harris, 536 U.S. 639 (2002)

Acknowledgments

As is always the case with writing books, we could not have completed this one without the help of many other individuals as part of the process. We apologize in advance for any names we may have forgotten; of course, our aim is to acknowledge those who helped either directly with the book or in terms of inspiration and encouragement along the way. Whether this be family, work colleagues, graduate school colleagues, or others in our lives, acknowledging their importance to this effort is key.

We want to start by thanking the following individuals for reading portions of the book project, the prospectus, or some combination of both of these things. First, critical comments by Tom Clark, Susanne Schorpp, and Amy Steigerwalt on a previous working paper forced us to engage with questions that spawned the idea for this book. Next, we wish to give thanks to Wendy Martinek and Eric Segall for providing critically important comments on the initial book prospectus. As this is a first book for both of us, their experience and insights were valuable in helping us see the weaknesses in our initial idea and in understanding how to frame the full book in a more cohesive way. We thank the following individuals who read several chapters, either in book chapter form or in conference paper form: Mike Nelson read and provided substantial feedback on earlier versions of Chapters 5 and 7; Brian Frye provided helpful comments on Chapter 2; Anna Law and Tom Hansford read and commented on an early version of Chapter 5; and Brent Boyea read and commented on an early version of Chapter 6. Most crucially, we want to thank Todd Curry and Kirk Randazzo for providing feedback on the book in its entirety, before completion, with an ambitious turnaround time request. Your feedback has been integral to making the book a stronger one. We also want to thank the anonymous reviewers for providing very important feedback to the project,

and, equally importantly, encouraging Cambridge University Press to give this book a chance.

Finally, we want to thank Matt Gallaway, our editor at Cambridge University Press, for providing us with tremendous amounts of publishing-related information and encouragement, and all the editorial staff who helped transform the book from a “long manuscript” into a finished product. Your patience, help, and belief in this project has been absolutely integral to helping us complete the book. Without your hard work, prompt answers to questions, and help navigating the editorial process, the completion of this book would certainly not have been possible.

Additional acknowledgments for Mike: As a first-generation college graduate, I have always felt like a bit of an outsider in academia. Having supportive mentors and colleagues throughout my time as an undergraduate, in graduate school, and as a faculty member have enabled any successes that I have had. Without Kirk Randazzo and Lee Walker seeing something in a poor kid with a thick Kentucky accent, I would never have considered going to graduate school or pursuing an academic career. I was then lucky enough to have both Kirk and Lee on my dissertation committee (along with Don Songer) at a different institution. Their continuous support throughout my career has always been a source of motivation for me.

I would also like to thank my colleagues at Georgia State University for their support. I am truly fortunate to be in an incredibly collegial department where everyone supports and encourages each other. Getting to go to work everyday and interact with intellectually inspiring colleagues and students makes me a better scholar. I would also like to offer my gratitude to some specific individuals. Countless conversations with public law colleagues Bob Howard, Susanne Schorpp, and Amy Steigerwalt have been valuable when I was fighting with various questions throughout this project. Additionally, Jelena Subotic, Jeff Lazarus, and others were extremely helpful when I had questions about the book publishing process.

Beyond my professional colleagues, the support of family has been essential both in general and for this book specifically. Anytime I felt the impostor syndrome that plagues many of us, my family has always believed in me. I especially thank Autumn and Savannah. In addition to their support, I appreciate their understanding when this book project led to me working lots of long nights and weekends when I would have normally been doing family activities. I also thank my mother and my grandparents for their constant support and encouragement. While my grandparents never completed high school, they were always some of my biggest cheerleaders (even if they did not

understand exactly what I did). I wish they had lived to see the completion of this book, but I dedicate it to their memory.

Additional acknowledgments for Ben: Many have broadly inspired me along the way, including current and former colleagues. I want to personally thank all of my colleagues at the University of North Dakota's Department of Political Science and Public Administration for believing in the quality of my work. You have collectively been a great source of encouragement and help, from initial discussions about the book project to questions I have had about the publishing process. Special thanks are also due to my former public law colleagues at Georgia State's Department of Political Science. These include Mike Evans, Bob Howard, Susanne Schorpp, and Amy Steigerwalt. Thank you very much for providing me with help and encouragement regarding my career and research. Still other collaborators on other research projects have been especially helpful with guidance, mentoring, and support: these include Greg Goelzhauser, Matt Hitt, Ali Masood, Doug Rice, and Chuck Finocchiaro. I thank you all.

I also want to take a moment to thank my family, both close and extended, who have believed in me over my life. Your faith and interest over the course of my life and career have been critical. It would not have been possible to finish this book without your consistent encouragement and interest in my work. My mother deserves special thanks for her interest, enabling me to have research time when visiting so I could be as productive as possible, or encouraging me to take a needed break ... You should know that I appreciate these things greatly. Chris, Jenn, Matt, and Rick, you also deserve special recognition for your encouragement in my career and for lending helping hands and ears when I needed these things the most. It is impossible for me to repay this in kind, but for all of my family, both those specifically named and those unnamed, just know that I love you all.

Finally, I want to thank my former dissertation chair and mentor, Donald Songer. Unfortunately, while Don was not able to see the completion of this book, his encouragement for me to further develop my research agenda and his specific help on my first published article (in *Political Research Quarterly* in 2012), planted the seeds that germinated and led to this project. Don's steadfast support, and encouraging yet critical feedback, are tremendously missed by all of his former students, including me. Don, I thank you for providing me with the mindset and skills needed to be able to bring this project to completion, and for your constant encouragement and for prodding me to think about the implications of my theories. Without the support and prodding, I am sure that this book would not have seen the light of day.