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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 a fresh approach was needed because, as professors who regularly teach courses on public law, and as scholars concerned with judicial processes, we saw a growing disparity between what we taught 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 understood that to know the law is to know only part of the story. A host of political factors—internal and external—influence the Court’s decisions and shape the development of constitutional law. These include the ways 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 elected officials take, to name just a few.

Because we thought no existing book adequately combined legal factors with the influences of the political process, we wrote one. In most respects, our book follows tradition: readers will find that we include excerpts from the classic cases that best illustrate the development of constitutional law. But our focus is different, as is the appearance of this volume. We emphasize the arguments raised by lawyers and interest groups and the politics surrounding litigation. We include tables and figures on Court trends and other materials that bring out the rich legal, social, historical, economic, and political contexts in which the Court reaches its decisions. 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 constitutional law. As instructors, we find our subject inherently interesting—to us, law is exciting stuff. Many of the books available, 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. We describe the events that led to the suits and include photographs of litigants and relevant exhibits from the cases. Moreover, because students often ask us about the fates of particular litigants—for example, what happened to the “Scottsboro boys”?—and hearing that colleagues elsewhere are asked similar questions, we decided to attach “Aftermath” boxes to a select set of cases. In addition to providing final chapters to these stories, the focus on the human element leads to interesting discussions about the decisions’ impacts on the lives of ordinary Americans. 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.

Finally, to broaden students’ perspectives on the U.S. legal system, we have added boxes on the laws and legal practices of other countries. Students and instructors can use these to compare and contrast U.S. Supreme Court decisions over a wide range of issues, such as the death penalty, prayer in schools, and libel, with policies developed in other countries. The use of foreign law sources in their opinions has sparked some dissension among the justices, and we have found that the material we include here inspires lively debates in our classes. We hope it will do so in yours as well.

**Important Revisions**

In preparing this ninth edition, we have strengthened the distinctive features of the earlier versions by making changes at all three levels of the book—organization, chapters, and cases. Material on the First Amendment has been reorganized to highlight the historical development of the Court’s interpretation of the Religious Establishment clause. Despite decades of interpretation, the clause continues to be the subject of substantial litigation as the Court’s 2014 decision in *Town of Greece v. Galloway* illustrates. Likewise, we have thoroughly revised and reorganized the discussion of discrimination to provide a more contemporary take on the equal protection clause. We don’t know about you, but in our classes we tell our students that when the justices apply rational basis scrutiny to a government classification, they will almost always uphold it. Cases of the last few decades suggest important caveats to this generalization.

The most significant changes are in the individual chapters. All have been thoroughly updated to include important opinions handed down through the 2014 term. Since Chief Justice Roberts took office in 2005, the Court has taken up many pressing issues of the day, including gun control (*District of Columbia v. Heller*), campaign finance regulation (*Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*), hate speech (*Snyder v. Phelps*), and, of course, same-sex marriage (*Obergefell v. Hodges*).

The chapters that follow contain discussions of the cases, along with many others from the Roberts Court. For example, Chapter 5 provides expanded coverage of issues the Court has recently addressed, such as constitutional protection for false statements (*United States v. Alvarez*) and protest demonstrations (*McCullen v. Coakley*). Chapter 14 examines the Court’s responses to disputes over election campaign finance regulations (*McCutcheon v. FEC*) and voting rights (*Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder*). And the criminal procedure chapters now include material on disputes over non-physically invasive searches such as the drug detection dog ruling in *Florida v. Jardines*. Last but certainly not least, as we suggest above, Chapters 10 (Privacy) and 13 (Discrimination) provide extensive coverage of the Court’s decisions relating to sexual orientation—from *Bowers v. Hardwick*, which upheld bans on sodomy to *Obergefell*, which invalidated bans on same-sex marriage.

Two editions ago, we made a change in our presentation of the case material: for each excerpted case, we noted key arguments made by the attorneys on both sides. Our goal was to highlight the array of important claims before the Court, and not simply those the justices chose to highlight. This addition proved popular with students and instructors alike, and so we have retained it in this new edition.

We have also retained and enhanced other features pertaining to case presentation that have proved to be useful. The Aftermath boxes not only remain but have increased in number—a testament to the positive feedback we have received. We continue to excerpt concurring and dissenting 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.

We also continue to provide universal resource locators (URLs) to the full texts of the opinions and, where available, to a Web site containing audio recordings of oral arguments in many landmark cases. We have taken this step for much the same reason that we now highlight attorneys’ arguments: reading decisions in their entirety and listening to oral arguments can help students to develop the important skill of differentiating between compelling and less compelling arguments. Finally, we continue to retain the historical flavor of the decisions, reprinting verbatim the original language used in *U.S. Reports* to introduce the justices’ writings. Students will see that during most of its history the Court used the courtesy title “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, 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.

We have made some cuts along the way as well. Most notably, adopters of previous editions will see that we’ve trimmed the number of appendixes in the “Reference Material” section. Because so much of the material they contained is now readily available from reliable sources on the Internet, we made the decision to delete them to make room for more case material and narrative.

**Student and Instructor Resources**

We continue to update and improve our Online Con Law Resource Center located at http://clca.cqpress.com and hope instructors find this a valuable resource for assigning supplemental cases and useful study aids, as well as for accessing helpful instructor resources. Through the supplemental case archive professors and students can access excerpts of important decisions that we mention in the text but that space limitations and other considerations counsel against excerpting. Cases included in the online archive are indicated by boldface italic type in the text, and a complete list appears in Appendix 4; in the archive these cases are introduced and excerpted in the same fashion as they are in the book. The archive now houses more than two hundred cases; we will continue to keep it current, adding important decisions as the Court hands them down.

The Online Resource Center also features some very handy study tools for students: a set of interactive flash cards for each chapter that will help students review key terms and concepts, and links to a wealth of data and background material from CQ Press’s reference sources, such as *Guide to the U.S. Supreme Court*, *The Supreme Court A to Z*, and our *Supreme Court Compendium* (which we coauthored with the Harold J. Spaeth and Jeffrey A. Segal). Students can click to a bio of any justice, read a background piece on the origins of the Court, and view selected data tables on ideological means or on voting interagreements among justices by issue area. Also available are new hypothetical cases—sixteen for this volume—written by Stephen Daniels of the American Bar Foundation and Northwestern University and James Bowers of St. John Fisher College. These rich, detailed hypotheticals, tied to specific chapters, are accompanied by both discussion and writing questions that will help spark conversation and serve as the basis for writing assignments.

We are grateful to Tim Johnson of the University of Minnesota for producing a great set of instructor’s resources. In addition to a test bank that includes multiple-choice, short-answer, and hypothetical questions, he has created a set of discussion questions for each chapter. There are also case briefs for every case excerpted in the book and a full set of PowerPoint lecture slides. We’d also like to thank Rorie Spill Solberg of Oregon State University and Liane Kosaki of the University of Wisconsin–Madison for their Moot Court Simulation in the Resource Center. Instructors can choose hypothetical cases and utilize their guidelines so students can play the roles of counsel or chief or associate justice. Rorie and Liane also blog for the Resource Center, tying current news events and developments to content in *Constitutional Law for a Changing America*. We encourage all of our readers to check out “Without Prejudice” on the home page of the Resource Center.

Instructors can also download all the tables, figures, and charts from our book (in PowerPoint or JPG formats) for use during lecture. To access all of these resources, be sure to click on “instructor resources” once at clca.cqpress.com so you can register and start downloading.
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