



- [Home](#)
- [Orders and Opinions](#)
- [Commentary and Analysis](#)
- [New Filings](#)
- [Petitions to Watch](#)
- [Term Tracker](#)

[RSS Feed](#)

[Might it happen? Slaughterhouse overruled?](#)

Monday, July 20th, 2009 5:30 am | Lyle Denniston | [Print This Post](#)

Analysis

For generations, lawyers, judges and constitutional scholars across the spectrum have debated whether the time would come for the Supreme Court to cast aside one of history's most controversial rulings — the 5-4 decision in 1873 in the *Slaughterhouse Cases*. In that ruling, the dissenters claimed — and modern critics still complain — that the Court had made the Fourteenth Amendment's Privileges and Immunities Clause into “a vain and idle enactment.”

Despite a brief revival of the Clause as a curb on state power to restrict individual rights, in the 1999 decision in *Saenz v. Roe* involving “the right to travel,” that part of the Fourteenth Amendment's Section 1 has remained close to a constitutional dead letter. (It reads: “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.”)

In 1873, the Court said the Clause only restricted state laws affecting rights of national citizenship, not those affecting the rights of state citizens. Among others who have argued in recent years that the Court should rethink the *Slaughterhouse Cases*, Justice Clarence Thomas is the most prominent. He did so in a dissent in *Saenz v. Roe*, saying that, “in an appropriate case,” he would be open to reevaluating the meaning of the Clause.

Sometime this Fall, the Court will examine three cases that already are being pushed as “appropriate” ones for the Court to use for a reexamination of the Clause, and the *Slaughterhouse* precedent.

This is, in fact, a little-noticed part of the controversy already building around those new cases. The core issue, in all three, is whether the Court will expand the Second Amendment personal right to have a gun for self-defense, so that it restricts state and local government laws, not just those at the federal level (an issue that had a prominent role in the just-concluded nomination hearings for Justice-to-be Sonia Sotomayor. She will have a chance to vote on some of the new cases, it appears.)

Under constitutional theory, there are only three ways that the Court could interpret the Second Amendment as applying to the states. The Constitution's text rules out one of those, the *Slaughterhouse Cases* rules out a second, and the one remaining — “incorporation” of the Second Amendment into the Fourteenth Amendment so that it reaches states — is not an attractive option to constitutional conservatives. Thus, the impending challenge to the *Slaughterhouse* precedent.

The one federal appeals court that has ruled, so far, that the Second Amendment protects personal gun rights against state, county and city laws is the Ninth Circuit. It took the only option it said was open to it: the incorporation theory under the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause.

The text of the Constitution itself makes the Second Amendment apply only to federal laws; that has been the constitutional understanding since 1833 (*Barron v. Baltimore*), the Ninth Circuit noted in *Nordyke v. King*, a ruling it issued in April and is still pondering whether to reconsider *en banc*.

It follows from the *Slaughterhouse Cases*, the Ninth Circuit added, “that the Privileges and Immunities Clause did not protect the right to keep and bear arms because it was not a right of citizens of the United States.” That, it indicated, remains good law, even after the Supreme Court's decision in *Heller v. District of Columbia* in 2008 recognized a constitutional right to have a gun under the Second Amendment.

Only the Supreme Court would have the authority (absent a new constitutional amendment) to overturn the *Slaughterhouse Cases*. Two other Circuit Courts — the Second (in an opinion joined by Judge Sotomayor) and the Seventh — refused to extend the Second Amendment to the states, concluding that they were bound by Supreme Court precedents.

The Second and Seventh Circuit rulings are the ones now being challenged in the Supreme Court in three cases: *Maloney v. Rice* (08-1592) — the Second Circuit case — and *National Rifle Association v. Chicago* (08-1497) and *McDonald v. Chicago* (08-1521) — both from the

Seventh Circuit. (Because Judge Sotomayor participated in the *Maloney* case at the Second Circuit, she probably would not take part in any action by the Justices on that case.)

In the *NRA* petition, its lawyers argue alternative points for applying the Second Amendment to the states — the “incorporation” method, and applying it through the Privileges and Immunities Clause. The petition does not include extensive argument on the *Slaughterhouse Cases*, though that precedent is mentioned.

The *McDonald* petition goes further, suggesting the reconsideration of *Slaughterhouse* if the Court is unwilling to use the other, incorporation method, to extend the Second Amendment. It argues:

“The almost meaningless construction given this [Privileges and Immunities] provision in *Slaughterhouse* was wrong the day it was decided and today stands indefensible.”

The *Maloney* petition takes a somewhat cautious approach. It suggests that the *Slaughterhouse Cases* need not be overruled directly, but should be reinterpreted. It makes an argument likely to appeal to conservative Justices and others: re-reading that old precedent to extend Second Amendment rights, but to do so in a way that keeps the Privileges and Immunities Clause from becoming as “open-ended” as it says other parts of the Fourteenth Amendment have become.

A full exploration of the Clause and the *Slaughterhouse* precedent has been put before the Court in an *amicus* brief filed by the advocacy groups, Institute for Justice and the Cato Institute (filed in the Chicago cases; it can be downloaded [here](#)).

In a clear pitch to Justice Thomas, the brief quotes his dissent in *Saenz*, and comments: “Restoring the Privileges and Immunities Clause to its proper place in the constitutional structure would have the advantage of tethering this Court’s rights-protecting jurisprudence much more closely to the Constitution’s text and history” than other parts of the Fourteenth Amendment have.

One of the reasons that Justice Thomas has suggested a possible reexamination of *Slaughterhouse* is a concern, apparently shared by other Justices and conservative commentators, to rein in the use of other clauses in the Fourteenth Amendment in the Court’s jurisprudence.

[Share This](#)

No Comments

No comments yet.

Sorry, the comment form is closed at this time.

- links open new windows

Search

Search this site

Search the S. Court Docket

Search SCOTUSWiki

[View the OT08 case index](#)

Press

- [WaPo: As Questioner, Lawmaker Is Man on Own Mission](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [NYT: A Nominee on Display, But Not Her Views](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [Bloomberg: Sotomayor Nomination Moves Toward Senate Approval](#) (Added 2 days ago)

- [WSJ: Sotomayor Plays Hearing Close to Vest](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [NYT: Post-Sotomayor Nominations Are at Stake in Hearings](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [NLJ: Sotomayor Hearing Revives Old Battle](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [WSJ: Praise, Skepticism Greet Sotomayor](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [WaPo: Hearings Not Just About Sotomayor](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [WaPo: Quiet and Calm Outside Sotomayor Hearings](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [WaPo: 'Jane Roe' Arrested at Supreme Court Hearing](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [CNN Poll: Do Americans want Sotomayor confirmed?](#) (Added 9 days ago)
- [AP: Mock exercises prepare Sotomayor for hearings](#) (Added 9 days ago)
- [WSJ: Some Clinton-Era Sotomayor Materials Withheld From Public](#) (Added 10 days ago)
- [NYT: To Get to Sotomayor's Core, Start in New York](#) (Added 10 days ago)
- [NYT: From Sotomayor Rulings, a Wealth of Data](#) (Added 11 days ago)
- [WaPo: Uncommon Detail Marks Rulings by Sotomayor](#) (Added 11 days ago)
- [WSJ: GOP Lowers Its Goals For Sotomayor Hearing](#) (Added 11 days ago)
- [NYT: The Place of Women on the Court](#) (Added 11 days ago)
- [NYT: Senators Settling Into New Roles to Weigh Sotomayor Nomination](#) (Added 11 days ago)
- [Politico: GOP war-games Sotomayor hearings](#) (Added 12 days ago)
- [NYT: Little Information Given About Solo Law Practice Run by Sotomayor in '80s](#) (Added 12 days ago)
- [NYT: In Two States, a Lower Bar for Conviction](#) (Added 13 days ago)
- [National Law Journal: A Dozen Themes Frame Sotomayor Hearing](#) (Added 14 days ago)
- [National Law Journal: Roberts Court Takes Narrow Road to Right](#) (Added 14 days ago)
- [LAT: Supreme Court Leaned Right on Many Issues This Term](#) (Added 14 days ago)
- [AP: Colin Powell Attacks Critics of Sotomayor](#) (Added 14 days ago)
- [AP: Analysis: GOP Struggles for Anti-Sotomayor Message](#) (Added 14 days ago)
- [NYT: Environment Groups Find Less Support on Court](#) (Added 14 days ago)

Commentary

- [USAT: Retire the 'Ginsburg rule'](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [Slate: What We Didn't Learn](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [WSJ: Four Lawyers Review Sotomayor's Performance](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [NY Daily News: Guess what? All judges make policy](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [Slate: What a Waste](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [Slate: Honesty at Last!](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [Judge Sonia Sotomayor and the Relationship between Leagues and Players: Insights and Implications](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [WSJ: The Seinfeld Hearings](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [News & Observer: Yes, the justices indeed 'make law'](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [WaPo: The Education of Sonia Sotomayor](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [NYT: Questions for Judge Sotomayor](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [National Journal: How Ricci Almost Disappeared](#) (Added 9 days ago)
- [WSJ: The Judge Sotomayor I've Faced](#) (Added 10 days ago)
- [USAT: A court ritual worth watching](#) (Added 10 days ago)
- [NYT: Age Discrimination](#) (Added 12 days ago)
- [NYT: Appointees Who Really Govern America](#) (Added 12 days ago)
- [Slate: Are All Civil Rights Special Privileges Now?](#) (Added 14 days ago)
- [Slate: The Supreme Court on Trial](#) (Added 14 days ago)
- [WaPo: Conservatively Liberal](#) (Added 14 days ago)

Blog Round-Up

- [Crime & Consequences: Sotomayor and the Permanent Constitution](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [Womenstake: Judge Sotomayor Provides Important Testimony on the Constitutional Right to Privacy and its Application to Reproductive Rights](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [BLT: Brits Leap Ahead of U.S. Supreme Court on Camera Access](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [ACSBlog: Final Thoughts on the Sotomayor Hearings](#) (Added 2 days ago)
- [WSJ Law Blog: Judge Bork on Judge Sotomayor, The 'Wise Latina' Is Not Qualified.](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [Legalities: Liberals Lash Out Against Sotomayor Testimony](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [Balkinization: Declining Marginal Utility of the Politics of Racial Resentment](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [BLT: Senators with Contrasting Experience Query Sotomayor](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [Volokh Conspiracy: The Sotomayor Hearings as a Step Forward for Property Right](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [Balkinization: Brief History of Supreme Court Partiality](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [PrawfsBlawg: Bork, Sotomayor, and the Double Edged Sword of Empathy](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [Crime and Consequences: Death Penalty Questions at Sotomayor Hearing](#) (Added 4 days ago)
- [Jost on Justice:Pols, Polls Divided as Hearings Begin](#) (Added 6 days ago)

- [Slate: Dialogue on the Sotomayor Hearings](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [WSJ Law Blog: Listening to History in the Sotomayor Debate](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [NYT: Live Blogging the Sotomayor Hearings](#) (Added 6 days ago)
- [Election Law Blog: Who Should Argue Citizens United?](#) (Added 9 days ago)
- [Election Law Blog: More Leaks on How Ricci was Decided in the Second Circuit](#) (Added 9 days ago)
- [True Slant: A preview of the GOP's anti-affirmative action witnesses](#) (Added 9 days ago)
- [The Ninth Justice: Women's Groups On Board](#) (Added 10 days ago)
- [CQ Politics: Star Witness: New Haven Firefighter Will Testify at Sotomayor Hearing](#) (Added 10 days ago)
- [BLT: New Report Looks at Sotomayor by the Numbers](#) (Added 10 days ago)
- [BLT: It's Still Kennedy's Court, Say Supreme Court Practitioners](#) (Added 12 days ago)
- [BLT: ABA Committee Gives Sotomayor Top Rating](#) (Added 12 days ago)
- [Oxford University Press Blog: I Was for Sam. Now I'm for Sonia.](#) (Added 13 days ago)
- [Concurring Opinions: Truthseeking and Criminal Procedure in the Supreme Court's Last Term](#) (Added 13 days ago)
- [Volokh: Is the Roberts Court "Anti-Environment"?](#) (Added 14 days ago)

Email Digest Sign-Up

Receive a daily email digest from Feedburner by entering your email

• Feedback

To comment, please email scotusblog.feedback@gmail.com



[View all coverage on Judge Sonia Sotomayor](#)











[Click here for the newest StatPack](#)

Recent Posts

- [Might it happen? Slaughterhouse overruled?](#)
- [The Week Ahead](#)
- [U.S. attacks \\$19 billion oil, gas "windfall"](#)
- [Breakthrough on torture](#)
- [October arguments, day by day](#)
- [Live Blog of Judge Sotomayor's Confirmation Hearings--Day 4](#)
- [Heritage Foundation Supreme Court Review Panel](#)
- [Live Blog of Judge Sotomayor's Confirmation Hearings--Day 3](#)
- [Schedule for Day 3 of Judge Sotomayor's Confirmation Hearings](#)
- [Live Blog of Judge Sotomayor's Confirmation Hearings--Day 2](#)
- [NPR and Live Blog coverage](#)
- [Box Score: Calling "balls and strikes" at Sotomayor's confirmation hearing](#)

Archives

Authors

-  [Tom](#)
Tom Goldstein
Partner, Akin Gump
-  [Amy](#)
Amy Howe
Partner, H&R
-  [Pattie](#)
Patricia Millett
Partner, Akin Gump
-  [Kevin](#)
Kevin Russell
Partner, H&R
-  [Lyle](#)
Lyle Denniston
Reporter, SCOTUSblog
-  [Kristina](#)
Kristina Moore
Howe & Russell
-  [Brian](#)
Brian Sagona
Akin Gump
-  [David](#)
David Stras
Univ. of Minnesota

Links

- [Supreme Court](#)
- [S. Ct. docket](#)
- [S. Ct. transcripts](#)
- [Solicitor General](#)
- [How Appealing](#)
- [Volokh Conspiracy](#)
- [Balkinization](#)
- [ABA Merits Briefs](#)
- [AP - Released Opinions](#)
- [Medill Case Summaries](#)
- [Oyez Oral Arguments](#)
- [Findlaw S. Ct.](#)
- [Findlaw S. Ct. opinions](#)
- [Cornell S. Ct.](#)
- [First Amendment Center](#)
- [Justice Talking](#)
- [Jurist Paperchase](#)