

[Forums](#) / [Lecture Material](#)[Help](#)

Q&A Session 2

✉ You are subscribed. [Unsubscribe](#)[Pinned](#) [UNRESOLVED](#) [introduce](#) × [+ Add Tag](#)Sort replies by: [Oldest first](#) [Newest first](#) [Most popular](#)[Ryan Mendías](#) STAFF · 2 days ago 

Hi everyone, at 4.30 pm EST (UTC-4), this thread will open for questions. Your teaching assistants Daniel and Lauren will respond to any questions about course themes for an hour.

The TAs will attempt to answer questions in order of how many up votes they have, so if you think one of your classmates has asked a particularly interesting question, make sure you let everyone know by up voting it!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Matthew Sedlak](#) · 2 days ago 

Professor Amar makes a strong case for reading the Constitution as a whole and taking it together with what he calls the unwritten Constitution. He makes it seem very cut and dry that a literal reading of the Constitution would be foolish but from what I understand this is a controversial view.

For example doesn't Justice Scalia believe in a very rigid reading of the Constitution. It does not see like he would consider things like historical context, the Federalist Papers, etc, as a valid tool to be used in interpreting the Constitution but rather only the words as ratified by the people.

My question is, if I am understanding his viewpoint properly, is how would someone like Justice Scalia respond to Professor Amar's claims?

↑ 5 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 days ago 

Matthew: here's what he'd likely say:

Our manner of interpreting the Constitution is to begin with the text, and to give that text the meaning that it bore when it was adopted by the people. I'm not a "strict constructionist," despite the introduction. I don't like the te

rm "strict construction." I do not think the Constitution, or any text should be interpreted either strictly or sloppily; it should be interpreted reasonably. Many of my interpretations do not deserve the description "strict." I do believe, however, that you give the text the meaning it had when it was adopted.

http://www.cfif.org/htdocs/freedomline/current/guest_commentary/scalia-constitutional-speech.htm

↑ 5 ↓ · flag

[clinton mathews](#) · 2 days ago 🔒

I, for one, would love to hear Justice Scalia debate Prof Amar on Amar's living Constitution!

↑ 4 ↓ · flag

[Lauren Biksacky](#) STAFF · 2 days ago 🔒

Matthew,

You are correct, Professor Amar and Justice Scalia have very different views about the appropriate way to read the Constitution. Both would openly acknowledge that they disagree with the other's view, and criticize the other school of thought.

For the types of arguments that someone like Scalia would make in response to Professor Amar's claims, a good place to start is skimming Scalia's latest book entitled "Reading Law" - or better yet, browsing some of the reviews or summaries of the book to see his key arguments.

Professor Amar actually has penned a book review on Scalia's new book, and you can read his critique here: <http://www.democracyjournal.org/27/originalist-sin.php>

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

[Matthew Sedlak](#) · 2 days ago 🔒

In looking at the quote from Alec, Justice Scalia says that "it should be interpreted reasonably" but in the opening paragraph of Professor Amar's review that Lauren posted he mentions that Scalia's book seems to imply that he would allow for a Vice President presiding over his own impeachment trial. Has anybody ever asked the Justice how he would respond to such a case?

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 days ago 🔒

Reading that review, Amar does seem to believe that if Scalia means what he says that Scalia

would let the VP preside. I don't know that Scalia's ever discussed this, though. The problem with Amar's review is that Scalia's book is about legal interpretation generally and Amar only wants to talk about constitutional interpretation. I think one could take Amar's A Fortiori argument as an "originalist" one for the proposition that the VP could NOT chair (i.e., that because the Constitution would not let him sit for the President, a fortiori the original understanding is that he could not do so for his own).

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

[ellen anderson](#) · 2 days ago

We rely on the Supreme Court to make decisions based on the Constitution. Has the Professor, to your knowledge, ever expressed if the court "got it wrong" on any cases they reviewed?

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 days ago

He's a big critic of the cases involving the so-called exclusionary rules (those that bar illegally obtained evidence in criminal trials) such as *Weeks v. US* and *Mapp v. Ohio*. Other cases he's criticized include *Dred Scott*, the *Slaughterhouse Cases* and *Pollack v. Farmers Loan and Trust*.

There are many cases where he agrees with the outcome, but criticizes the reasoning, such as those that rely on substantive due process.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[Lauren Biksacky](#) STAFF · 2 days ago

Yes, Professor Amar does not think the Court is above criticism, and does express concern when he believes the court "gets it wrong" based on the Constitution.

One salient example of a court case that Professor Amar disagreed with the ruling is the case of *Dred Scott*. Professor Amar argues that the decision was premised on incorrect reading of Article IV of the Constitution.

The optional reading for the class (*America's Constitution: A Biography*) outlines Professor Amar's reasons for disagreeing with the Court in Chapter 10.

Professor Amar has also identified other exemplars of how NOT to interpret the Constitution. He claims that three cases, including *Dred Scott* "occupy the lowest circle of constitutional Hell and are today denounced by lawyers and judges across the spectrum." The three cases are *Dred Scott*, *Lochner*, and *Plessy*.

For more on his disagreement with *Lochner*, see his blog post here:

<http://www.volokh.com/2012/09/12/de-habilitating-lochner-a-response-to-david-bernstein/>

Lauren

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

[Herb Weiner](#) · 2 days ago 🔒

First Amendment, Privacy, and the Do Not Call List

Many people argue that the Federal Do Not Call Registry imposes an unconstitutional restriction on the first amendment freedom of speech. I would argue that it is more like posting a No Trespassing sign on my property, which prohibits anyone from entering my property to exercise their free speech rights. What are the constitutional arguments on both sides of this issue?

↑ 4 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 days ago 🔒

Re: Counting

How does one go about "counting" for purposes of determining whether there is an unenumerated right or a privilege/immunity under the 9th or 14th amendments respectively? Let's say there's 50 state laws that say "thou shalt not" but polls show 80% of the public does this anyhow. Should the court say "if the people really want this they'll get the state laws repealed"? Or do they say what "the people" actually does trump state (or a federal) laws?

If the latter, doesn't this really mean that pollsters rather than the Justices are in charge of the Constitution given how much latitude exists in writing and interpreting polls?

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

[Emily Hull](#) Signature Track · 2 days ago 🔒

In what ways is this online course similar to the ConstiutionalLaw class at Yale?

↑ 7 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 days ago 🔒

I'd be interested in knowing this, but if this is the way he teaches his law school con law class (as opposed to his undergrad version) my jaw will hit the floor.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[Lauren Biksacky](#) STAFF · 2 days ago 🔗

Emily,

The online class is really similar to the Constitutional Law class at Yale in that Professor bases both classes around his two books, *America's Constitution: A Biography* and *America's Unwritten Constitution*. They are the foundation of both his courses, along with his Yale Law School course he teaches titled "Reading the Constitution." While there is more time and more lectures during the actual live class at Yale, often the material he discusses is exactly the same and draws on his legal work outline in the texts. The students in the course have a lot of additional reading as well, and more in-depth question and answer and class discussion time, so the Coursera course can be seen as a good introduction to the lectures and materials that Professor Amar discusses in his actual class. But I am often surprised having been a student in his live classes how much overlap there is between the material we covered and his live lectures. Sometimes I find myself laughing to myself because I know exactly what he will say next because we discussed the same issues in live lecture.

Lauren

↑ 5 ↓ · flag

[Daniel Herz-Roiphe](#) STAFF · 2 days ago 🔗

That's an interesting question. One way in which this class has a slightly different emphasis from a typical law school constitutional law course is that Professor Amar is particularly interested in the actual text of the Constitution, and the history that went into creating it, rather than just the many Supreme Court cases interpreting it. Law school classes often tend to focus on judge-made law. While this course spends some time exploring judicial doctrines, it also focuses more on the Constitution itself, as well as the ways in which non-judicial actors (like the President) have added their gloss to the original text.

Daniel

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · a day ago 🔗

Professor Amar may teach much of this material and focus on the text more than many of his law school colleagues, but he DID author a more traditional law school casebook and I assume that his law students actually read cases like those at every other law school in the country.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Joel Kovarsky · a day ago

Alec,

I presume that was a last-ditch attempt to avoid having to post a video of your jaw hitting the floor. :-)

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Alec D. Rogers · 21 hours ago

I have a glass jaw.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 19 hours ago

DOWN GOES FRAZIER.. DOWN GOES FRAZIER..DOWN GOES FRAZIER...

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Linda R Garfinkel · 2 days ago

Hi Ellen - The professor eluded in one of his lectures to disagreeing with a fairly recent decision disagreeing with the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Lauren Biksacky STAFF · 2 days ago

Linda and others interested in the topic,

Here is Professor Amar's take and explanation of his view of the Voting Rights Act. It is a pretty technical read and beyond the scope of the class, but if you are interested in the topic, take a look.

http://www.harvardlawreview.org/issues/126/february13/forum_989.php

He argues that the Voting Rights Act's selective preclearance requirement must be constitutional because the Reconstruction Amendments themselves became law through a similar process of selective preclearance in which some southern states were required to ratify these Amendments to regain their positions in Congress.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Linda R Garfinkel · 2 days ago

Here is a link to the decision:

http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/26/us/supreme-court-ruling.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

A post was deleted

James Rath Signature Track · 10 minutes ago

Professor Amar seems to glorify the ratification process with statements like, "the people knew what they were doing when they approved this piece of the Constitution" or "the people fully understood the meaning of this piece of the Constitution." (The phrases in quote marks are given as generic examples, not specific quotes. It would be easy to find the specific quotes.) However, the people could only vote Yes or No on the draft document. No amendments allowed. We can never know if the people supported or understood a particular clause of the draft. What is the purpose of attributing such "wisdom" to the people when there is very little evidence to support such claims?

Further, the people who voted were hardly representative of the citizens of the 13 colonies. Professor Amar in his earliest lectures spoke of the process as being "democratic" given the times in which the process took place. But that qualification seems to be lost in the hyperbolic gush as to the role the people played in ratifying the Constitution.

Jim

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Patrick Anthony Drake · in a minute

Extraordinary analysis.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Alan Collins · 2 days ago

I'm going back to early lectures. Professor Amar has mentioned multiple times how democratic the ratification process was. Is there an actual vote count on a state by state basis? Did the various 1787/8 ratifications resemble today's referendums? Were ratifications an example of direct voting by citizens?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Alec D. Rogers · 2 days ago

Alan - remember that those were actually conventions and that the "voting" by "the people"

was who would go to the convention. Of course people could vote by proxy by selecting candidates who supported their own positions, but they were not referendums whereby the votes that counted were those of "the People" as opposed to those of their elected delegates.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Lauren Biksacky · STAFF · 2 days ago 🔗

Alan,

Alec beat me to the punch and explained the ratification process nicely. The voting that the People were doing was not actually for the Constitution itself, but the delegates who would decide on the ratification of the Constitution.

This website actually has been very helpful for my own knowledge about the state ratifying conventions, and has many useful interactive graphics and explanations:

<http://teachingamericanhistory.org/ratification/general-overview/>

Lauren

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

james mark leggett · 2 days ago 🔗

in answering the questions to Heeding the Deed Part ii, i could not submit my answers. Guess the server was not working properly.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Angela Yarbrough · 2 days ago 🔗

Prof. Amar says in last week's lecture that the federal army was used to help implement the process by which the 14th Amendment was ratified. He says that this shows a more favorable view toward the army than the founders had, and argues that this is what makes the draft constitutional.

Could you give some details about how the army was used to implement the 14th Amendment?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Alec D. Rogers · a day ago 🔗

Angela - I take this to mean (a) the Union Army won the war, without which there'd be no 14th amendment on a continent wide basis and (b) reconstruction was maintained with soldiers being stationed in the South, and they were not withdrawn fully until after the 1876 election.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Angela Yarbrough](#) · a day ago 🔗

Thanks Alec. If that is all it means it seems like a weak basis for the argument that the draft is constitutional.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Michael Scott](#) Signature Track · a day ago 🔗

Most wars the losers are hung. Lincoln, Sherman and Grant would have all hung had the south won. Harry Truman and Curtis LeMay would have both been executed as war criminals if the Japanese would have won WW2. The lesson is don't start a war but once you are in one keep after your opponent till he and all his colleagues are dead.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 21 hours ago 🔗

Angela - If Amar's reading of McCullough is correct (that a national bank is simply inherent in a Constitution meant to, among other things, provide for the common defense) it would seem to be a better basis for the draft than this stuff about the Union army.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Angela Yarbrough](#) · 18 hours ago 🔗

Alec, I agree.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Michael Scott](#) Signature Track · 18 hours ago 🔗

What was the maximum points? It doesn't give any weight to the number grade

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 16 hours ago 🔗

On the essay? 15 was the highest score possible.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

[Patrick Anthony Drake](#) · 2 days ago 🔗

Do antiquated processes in government prompt disenfranchisement? For example, Article V and

the proposal of Amendments.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Zoe · 21 hours ago 🔗

I can't find how the essays get graded. Do any of you know about this? TIA

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 19 hours ago 🔗

Zoe

The haven't told us yet. I suspect the TA's are swamped we could have hundreds of students in the class. They will let us know when they finish.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Angela Yarbrough · 18 hours ago 🔗

The essays were graded via peer review.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 18 hours ago 🔗

So you have yours back..I don't think anybody else knows what their grade was. Still waiting to know what the maximum grade was for the first essay. We don't have to make this like we are searching the newspapers if we passed the bar exam or not.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Angela Yarbrough · 18 hours ago 🔗

Really? So I click on "peer assessments" to the left, then scroll down to the option I wrote on (#3 in my case), and click, "go to assignment." I then see at the top: Your effective grade is: __ (# in the blank).

This isn't working for others?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Alec D. Rogers · 18 hours ago 🔗

We've had entire threads devoted to helping people understand why they got the scores they did on the first essay.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 18 hours ago 


So is it classified to know what the highest score that was possible? All I care about is on the first essay was it worth 20 points maximum?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Angela Yarbrough · 17 hours ago 

As I understand it, there are 5 categories worth a maximum of 3 points each, so the maximum possible score is 15. If you scroll down past your essay you will see what you got in each category.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 17 hours ago 

I saw what I was given I just didn't remember how the Essay's were graded. I am happy with my grade but not having the weighted amount is inconsistent with what they show on our quizzes. Not having the value declared is a bonehead play. Thanks for your help Ms. Yarbrough...

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Alec D. Rogers · 16 hours ago 

Multiply your score x1.3333 to get your total points out of a possible 100. So if you got a 10 that makes for 13.3333 points. You need 70 total points to get a certificate.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · 2 days ago 

I still don't know the result (grade), of my essay. How would I find out?
Thanks. Joao

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Lauren Biksacky STAFF · 2 days ago 

Joao,

Post your problem to the thread on the discussion board about technical problems so that one of the tech people sees your post. I do not know much about the technical posting of the grades. Sorry!

Lauren

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Herberth Samael Lobos · 2 days ago

who was the most important person to try to incorporate the woman's vote?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Margaret Morneau · 2 days ago

With technology and the internet growing so quickly in business and the rest of the world, how do you see the Constitution being affected in the future? Do you foresee a "freedom of technology" amendment or an amendment that would restrict access?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Bruce Ungar · 2 days ago

James, Doris Kearns Goodwin's book No Ordinary Time references a proposal made by Eleanor Roosevelt to have corporations make financial contributions during WW 2 analogous to the contributions of draftees in risking life and limb in the War. My best recollection is that It was rejected by representatives of the corporate business community when floated by the Administration and was never implemented

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 2 days ago

Bruce the manufacturers of the 1940s are a complete different animal compared to the Military Industrial Complex of the 1960s till the present. There are very restrictive rules that people working for the government have to follow when spending money appropriated by Congress.. People with a few years in that environment wouldn't be much use to free enterprise world.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

James Rath Signature Track · 2 days ago

We learned that the President cannot be indicted for a crime by a state or a city. How is it that a President can be sued civilly by a citizen? Why doesn't the same principle hold?

Jim

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Daniel Herz-Roiphe STAFF · 2 days ago 🔒

Hi James. This issue was addressed in the famous Supreme Court case of Clinton v. Jones (as in Paula Jones, who was suing the President for sexual harassment), in which the Court held that the President was not immune from civil suits. You can take a look at the Court's reasoning here: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/520/681>.

Daniel

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Stephen Jones · 2 days ago 🔒

How important is the original intent of the authors of a federal law or constitutional amendment in interpreting the application of the law? In *Sebelius v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc* one question is whether Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 applies to a profit making corporation. Rep. Jerry Nadler, one of the architects of RFRA in the House said that "once you went into the commercial sector, you couldn't claim a religious liberty to discriminate against somebody. That never came up. It was completely obvious we weren't talking about that." Can the Supreme Court ignore the original intent of the law. Similarly, the federal judges that have ruled in favor of gay marriage have cited the "equal protection clause" of the fourteenth amendment. I am not aware of any discussion for gay rights when the fourteenth amendment was passed and ratified. How should the Supreme Court consider the "equal protection clause" in this case and other cases involving discriminated individuals previously not considered in 1868.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Daniel Herz-Roiphe STAFF · 2 days ago 🔒

Hey Stephen. The original intent of the drafters of a provision--whether a Constitutional provision, like the Equal Protection Clause, or a statutory one, like RFRA--does often carry great weight. For an example, check out *DC v. Heller*, in which the Court spends a great deal of time and effort trying to ascertain the original intent of the Second Amendment's Framers: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/07-290.ZS.html>. However, it certainly isn't the only factor in play. Some might say that the text that the framers actually wrote down and voted on is considerably more important than whatever thoughts they had in their heads, or that a whole host of factors, such as historical developments and precedents, should hold more sway. Professor Amar discusses many of these different types of approaches in the second half of the course.

Daniel

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Robinson Fernandes · 2 days ago

Hi TA's Daniel and Lauren, hi everyone. My doctorate program research and thesis are focusing on situations and scenarios that the relations are to be considered unconstitutional due to the judicial law review in a non restraint judicial review over a law passed by the legislatura. For instance, a judicial review about a law passed by legislatura for compliance to the Constitution concerning about the qualifications required to anyone in a public selection to be hired by the State, like be graduated. Let's consider a non restraint statement coming back to its origins, or ab initio, what would be usual, like the law has never existed. So, could the person in this case be fired due to the unconstitutional relations? What about the relations stablished? In these situations could the Supreme Court here in Brazil or a court in any Nation that works in a similar way applies or consider the consumed fact theory (or the fait accompli, in French) in order to maintain the stablished relations validity? Some American's authors (I don't remember the name now) undersand that in some cases like that the past shouldn't be erased as it has never happened or existed. That's what I am looking into. If you or anyone have any information about or any case abroad I would be glad.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Zoe · 2 days ago

Okay can someone tell me if Week 8 is a typo? I downloaded it so I can read it later on and when it downloads it says Week 9??? Or week 8 didn't get placed up there??? TIA

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Greg Wilson · 2 days ago

Since the ACA has been determined to be a tax by the Supreme Court, don't we have a Constitutional problem because the ACA originated in the Senate and the Constitution states "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives"

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

James Rath Signature Track · 2 days ago

Evidently, the Supreme Court uses various levels of "scrutiny" in deciding a case. Could we learn about

"scrutiny?" Who decides the appropriate level? Where are the levels defined? Do all members of the Court need to use the same level of scrutiny when deciding a case?

Jim

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 days ago

James,

These terms are most often used in equal protection cases, and denote the tests a law or practice must meet in order to be upheld. If I recall cases involving racial discrimination involved "strict" scrutiny requiring that the state have (a) a compelling rationale that was (b) the most narrowly tailored approach possible. In contrast, economic discrimination just required a rationale basis. Sexual discrimination was somewhere in the middle.

Alec

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

[Hailey Sarno](#) · 2 days ago

When does Affirmative Action, or the idea of countering discrimination policies, take hold and by what process does a Judicial ruling go next before Congress and the President?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 days ago

Hailey,

In the US a judicial ruling is not directly reviewable except by a higher court.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

[Anonymous](#) · 2 days ago

If the President wholly disagrees with a Supreme Court ruling of an issue as being "unconstitutional" i.e(ACA, if it was in fact ruled as such) can the President continue to roll out the Act? The President is an elected official of and by "we the people", so can he insist that this Act is best for his constituents? In other words, can the President not only disagree/challenge the Supreme Court, can he ignore the Court's ruling?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Daniel Herz-Roiphe](#) STAFF · 2 days ago 🔒

To do that, the President would have to openly flout the Supreme Court's role in the three-branch system of government. That would arguably represent the total breakdown of our constitutional system. The judiciary would also have some means of self-help to avoid such an outcome. For example, if the Court had held the ACA unconstitutional, then if the IRS took a citizen to court for failing to pay the penalty for not obtaining health insurance, the judge in the case would presumably say that the citizen had no obligation to pay since the statute was void under the Constitution. But to an extent, our system--like any system of law--depends on the willingness of lawmakers to follow the rules.

Daniel

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Michael Scott](#) Signature Track · 2 days ago 🔒

ACA was not found to be unconstitutional. Read the Supreme Court under John Marshall's conflict with Andrew Jackson. The result is: "the trail of tears."

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

[Eduardo Felix da Cruz](#) · 2 days ago 🔒

Hi everyone. I would like to ask what is Professor Amar's reading of the 9th Amendment?

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people"

Are the other (rights) retained by the people derived from a) natural law, b) other laws passed by legislators, c) Amendments to the Constitution or all of the prior? Thanks.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag


[+ Comment](#)

[Douglas Errol Collinson](#) · 2 days ago 🔒

In Crimea recently (in a flawed but observed by international monitors etc) 83% of eligible voters went to the polls and ~97% of them voted for independence from Ukraine and incorporation into Russia.

President Obama and virtually all western leaders have said this was an illegal vote and therefore invalid. A few of those countries will soon have independence referendums involving segments of their nations (United Kingdom, Canada?, Spain?) and in those nations a majority vote within the referendum will lead to independence. My question is this - within the Constitution there appears to be no mechanism for any State or other grouping to declare independence from the US and in fact the Civil War was fought over this issue - is there any way that a state could voluntarily depart the union?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

 A post was deleted

Anonymous · 2 days ago 

This was discussed and there is no way to remove a state from the union. Also, a Russian run vote after it occupies a country is hardly a fair vote.


↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 2 days ago 

Suppose the Russian residents in Brighton Beach in NY decided they wanted to be part of mother Russia again? They are a majority of that part of Brooklyn. The Russians that lived in the Crimea were imports by the old commie government sent to run things and treat the locals badly. Twenty years ago they lost their good jobs when USSR went bust. If Putin is crazy enough to try to rebuild his empire then the world will have to deal with him like they did Schicklgruber...

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)


James Rath Signature Track · 2 days ago 

I was drafted. If corporations are people, why can't they be drafted -- as Truman tried to do to the Steel Industry during the Korean War? Why couldn't all corporation officers and stockholders be drafted and paid the US Army rates to take profit out of wars. Is this a radical idea? Is it Constitutional?

I am sure the Southerners who experienced the US Army in their villages after the Civil War were not impressed. Did their opinions count?

Jim

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 2 days ago 

James we live in a country that gives us only "the pursuit of happiness" less than 2% of our population has that right as a guarantee.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Zoe · a day ago 🔗

Thank you Michael.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Zoe · 2 days ago 🔗

Can someone tell me if there's a typo in Week 8? Because when I save it, it says Week 9 and I'm a bit confused. Did we skip Week 8? TIA

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Zoe · 2 days ago 🔗

I thought it was the Chief Justice????

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 2 days ago 🔗

Chief Justice is just for the President being impeached...

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

↓ scroll down for more ↓

