

About the Contributors

Randy E. Barnett is the Carmack Waterhouse Professor of Legal Theory at the Georgetown University Law Center where he teaches constitutional law and contracts. Additionally, he has been a visiting professor at the University of Pennsylvania, Northwestern University, and Harvard University law schools. Professor Barnett earned his bachelor's degree from Northwestern University in 1974 and his JD from Harvard Law School in 1977. In 2004, Professor Barnett appeared before the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Gonzalez v. Raich*, the last major case challenging the scope of Congress's commerce power before the challenge to the Affordable Care Act (ACA). In 2008, he was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship in constitutional studies. In 2010, Professor Barnett authored the first major academic article, "Commandeering the People: Why the Individual Health Insurance Mandate is Unconstitutional," that argued the individual mandate was unconstitutional. Later, Barnett joined the National Federation of Independent Business's litigation team as the case made its way to the Supreme Court. Among his publications are over one hundred law review articles and nine books, including *Restoring the Lost Constitution: The Presumption of Liberty* and casebooks on constitutional law and contracts. He has also appeared on programs such as *CBS Evening News*, *The NBC Nightly News*, and *Parker-Spitzer* (CNN).

Ilya Somin is professor of law at the George Mason University School of Law where his research focuses on constitutional law, property law, and the study of popular political participation and its implications for constitutional democracy. Somin is the author of *Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government Is Smarter*. He has served as a visiting professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, the University of Hamburg, and the University of Torcuato Di Tella in Argentina. Somin holds bachelor's degrees in political science and history from Amherst College, a master's degree in political science from Harvard, and a JD from Yale Law School. In addition to authoring scholarly articles on the challenge to the ACA, including "A Mandate for Mandates: Is the Individual Health Insurance Mandate Case a Slippery Slope?" in *Law and Contemporary Problems* and a forthcoming article explaining why the mandate was not "proper" even if it was necessary, he also authored numerous amicus briefs during the Obamacare litigation on behalf of the Washington Legal Foundation and a group of prominent constitutional law scholars, including one before the Supreme Court that explained why the Necessary and Proper Clause does not authorize the individual mandate—an argument eventually endorsed by a majority of the Supreme Court.

He is frequently published in both the scholarly and popular press, including the *Yale Law Journal*, the *Stanford Law Review*, the *Northwestern University Law Review*, as well as *Reason*, the *LA Times*, and *USA Today*.

Orin S. Kerr is the Fred C. Stevenson Research Professor of Law at the George Washington University School of Law. He is nationally recognized for his scholarship in criminal procedure and computer crime law. Professor Kerr holds a bachelor's degree in mechanical and aerospace engineering from Princeton University, a master's degree in mechanical engineering from Stanford University, and a JD from Harvard Law School. He has served as a trial attorney in the Computer Crime and Intellectual Property Section of the Criminal Division at the U.S. Department of Justice as well as a law clerk to Justice Kennedy on the United States Supreme Court. Professor Kerr has been widely published in academic journals as well as the popular press and counts among his publications the leading casebook in criminal procedure.

David E. Bernstein is the George Mason University Foundation Professor at the George Mason University School of Law. Professor Bernstein earned his bachelor's degree in history from Brandeis University and his JD from Yale Law School. Professor Bernstein has published dozens of law review articles, been quoted in numerous publications, and has been a guest on radio and television shows. In addition, he has authored or edited five books, including *Rehabilitating Lochner: Defending Individual Rights against Progressive Reform* and *You Can't Say That! The Growing Threat to Civil Liberties from Antidiscrimination Laws*.

David B. Kopel is the research director of the Independence Institute in Denver, Colorado, an associate policy analyst at the Cato Institute, and an adjunct professor at the University of Denver Sturm College of Law where he teaches advanced constitutional law. Professor Kopel holds a bachelor's degree in history from Brown University and a JD from Michigan Law School. His scholarly articles on Obamacare were published in the *Yale Law Journal*, the *Michigan Law Review*, and the *American Journal of Law & Medicine*. He authored two Supreme Court briefs in the Obamacare cases, one on the Necessary and Proper Clause, the other on the Medicaid mandate and the spending power. The arguments in both briefs were accepted by a majority of the Supreme Court. He is an expert on firearms policy, juvenile crime, drug policy, antitrust, constitutional law, criminal sentencing, and environmental law. He has authored 15 books and 85 scholarly articles, including the first law school textbook on the Second Amendment and *The Samurai, the Mountie, and the Cowboy: Should America Adopt the Gun Controls of Other Democracies?*, which was named book of the year by the American Society of Criminology, Division of International Criminology. He writes frequently for the *Wall Street Journal*, *National Review Online*, and other periodicals.

Jonathan H. Adler is the Johan Verheij Memorial Professor of Law at Case Western University School of Law where his primary focus is on environmental law issues. He earned his bachelor's degree in history from Yale University and his JD from

the George Mason University School of Law. A 2007 study identified Professor Adler as the most cited legal academic in environmental law under age forty. He has made countless media appearances and testified before Congress on a dozen occasions. His work has appeared in the *Harvard Environmental Law Review*, the *University of Illinois Law Review*, the *Boston College Law Review*, and many others. He is also the author or editor of five books including *Environmentalism at the Crossroads: Green Activism in America*; *The Costs of Kyoto: Climate Change Policy and Its Implications*; and *Ecology, Liberty and Property: A Free Market Environmental Reader*.

Trevor Burrus (Editor) is a research fellow in the Cato Institute's Center for Constitutional Studies. He received his bachelor's degree in philosophy from the University of Colorado at Boulder and his JD from the University of Denver Sturm College of Law. He was a primary author of the Cato Institute's briefs opposing the Affordable Care Act, and he assisted in coordinating the unprecedented level of amici involvement in the case. In addition to numerous popular publications, particularly as a national columnist for the *Huffington Post*, his work has also been published in the *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*, the *Vermont Law Review*, the *Syracuse Law Review*, and the *Widener Law Journal*.

Index

- Ackerman, Bruce, 100
- Act for the Relief of Sick and Disabled Seamen (1798), 33–34, 39
- activity. *See* activity/inactivity distinction; economic activity regulation; noneconomic activity regulation
- activity/inactivity distinction, 80
- assumptions and conclusions, 74–77
- commerce power of Congress and, 60–61, 107, 153n21
- economic decisions and, 60–61, 62
- examples of, 68–69, 104–6
- as first impression issue, 63
- in individual mandate, 72–74, 120–21
- intuitively, 113
- judicial bafflement, 103–4, 106–8
- mandates and, 80, 118
- multiple ways of determining, 108–11
- necessity and, 86–87, 210
- NFIB* in Supreme Court, 223–24, 245, 247–48
- omission as activity, 108, 109
- regulation of, 19, 72–74, 80
- in Steeh opinion, 60–61, 62, 72
- in Sutton opinion, 118–19, 120–21
- taxability of former vs. latter, 26
- act/omission distinction. *See* activity/inactivity distinction
- actuarial risk issue, 192–93, 204–5
- actus reus* requirement, 108–10, 113–14
- Adler, Jonathan, 22, 70, 108–9, 134, 141–42, 175, 184–85, 237, 239, 258, 272–73
- affirmative actions. *See* activity/inactivity distinction
- affirmative duties, 111
- Affordable Care Act (2010, ACA)
- challenges rested on technicality, 232
- future litigation, 265–66
- lawsuits against, after *NFIB*, 223
- loopholes, 6
- nonlegal arguments for, 206–10
- Obama and, 158–59
- passage and signing, 9–10, 101
- pillars, 2, 10
- popularity, 28
- public opinion about, 168, 206, 271
- significance of Supreme Court decision, 214–15, 235–37, 257–58, 268–70
- trajectory to Supreme Court, vii–viii, 65, 117
- agency law, 112
- Akaka, Daniel, 188
- Alito, Samuel
- as activist judge, 216
- actuarial risk and, 193
- background, ix–x
- individual mandate and, 224–25
- American Law Institute, 1
- Anti-Injunction Act (AIA)
- as barring challenges to individual mandate, 179
- in court of appeals, 145
- as inapplicable, 179–80
- preemptive challenges and, 157
- appellate courts. *See* courts of appeals
- as-applied challenges
- Raich* as, 166–67
- Roberts and facial vs., 249
- Supreme Court precedents, 170
- Sutton and facial vs., 119, 121–26, 132, 134–35
- winning, 167
- Atlantic*, 184–85, 270
- Bagenstos, Sam, 169
- Bailey v. Drexel Furniture*, 12–13, 196, 245, 246
- Balkin, Jack, 12, 26, 27, 35, 103, 266, 270

Barnes, Robert, 200
 Barnett, Randy, 3, 16, 19, 22, 27–28, 33, 40–41, 43–45, 66–69, 89, 103, 113, 117, 127, 162–63, 171, 183, 185, 186, 195, 197, 262, 269, 270, 271, 272
 Baucus, Max, 20, 22, 184–85
 Bernstein, David E., 172, 176, 238, 258
 Blackmun, Harry, 81
 blog posts, 1, 184–86, 270–73
 Bondi, Pam, 2
Bond v. United States, 151
Boumediene v. Bush, 128, 129–30, 184
Boy Scouts of America v. Dale, 90
 Breyer, Stephen, 101–2, 128, 182, 200, 228, 269
 broccoli analogy, 91–92, 105–6, 118, 225–26, 274
 Buck, Stuart, 234
 Buffett, Warren, 121
 burden of proof, 45, 127, 130, 131
Burroughs v. United States, 51, 85
 Burrus, Trevor, 139, 141, 143, 259
 Bush, George W., 232, 233
Bush v. Gore, 91, 241
 Butler, Stuart, 31
 capitation, 19–20, 103, 250
 Carvin, Michael D., 179, 193
 Casey, Lee, 11–15
 Cato Institute, 3, 31–32, 259
Champion v. Ames, 189
 circuit courts
 due process decisions, 132, 135
 interstate commerce rulings, 43
 split and likelihood of Supreme Court decision, 65, 117
 United States v. Lopez, 100–101
 circumstantial evidence, 242
Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 168, 203, 248–49
 class of activities issue, 122–23, 124–26, 134, 154n21
 Clement, Paul D., 179, 196
 Clyburn, James, 188
 Cohn, Jonathan, 169
 collective-action theory of federalism, 210–12
 commandeering, 69–70, 140, 151, 160, 161–63, 165–66

Commandeering the People: Why the Individual Health Insurance Mandate is Unconstitutional (Barnett), 66–67
 Commerce Clause, 239
 economic decisions doctrine under, 60–61
 Framers and, 3–4
 individual mandate and, 2–3, 22–23, 166, 189–90
 National Labor Relations Act and, 213
 penalties and, 146
 predictions about ruling on, ix
 rational basis test, 16
 Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 222, 235, 245
 wording, 14
 See also commerce power of Congress
 commerce power of Congress
 activity/inactivity distinction and, 60–61, 107, 153n21
 extent of, 3, 15–16, 21, 22–23, 66–67, 76, 77, 95–97, 136–37, 170–71, 212–13
 facial challenge tests to, 124–25
 individual mandate as not necessary under, 166
 intrastate activity and, 86–87, 88
 mandates and, 166
 noneconomic activity and, 11–12
 Obama view of, 199
 regulation of inactivity, 118–19
 regulation of prices, 148–49
 regulations vs. mandates, 21
 Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 258
 Supreme Court precedent prior to *NFIB*, 43–44, 72
 common law doctrine of duties, 109, 111
 community rating price controls, 2, 10, 179, 189, 193, 274
 compelled speech, 140–41
Comstock, United States v.
 enumerated powers and, 51
 federalism, 67–68, 76
 five-part test, 48–50, 52, 85, 94
 means to achieve ends, 85
 rationality of means and, 47–50, 53–54, 57n44, 99
 Roberts's actions, 52–53, 101–2
 conditional regulations, 105
 congressional powers
 baseline, 164

- extent of, 14, 95–97, 136, 176
- granted by Necessary and Proper Clause, 82–83
- judicial deference, 208
- power of purse, 222–23
- Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 231, 235–37, 257–58
- See also commerce power of Congress; enumerated powers of Congress; police power, plenary; taxing power of Congress
- constitutionality
 - of already approved federal programs/agencies, 34
 - arguments against, 10–12
 - aspirational, 35
 - beliefs about, and political realm, 170–71, 188, 270–71
 - Congressional consideration of legislation and, 21, 208
 - of expansion of federal powers, 13–14
 - of first impression issues, 64
 - of goal, 46–47
 - good ideas and, 5
 - of New Deal and Great Society, 34–35
 - originalism theory, 4, 38, 98–99, 207–9
 - popular will and changes, 27
 - predictions about, ix, 29–31, 65, 182, 183, 195–97, 214–15
 - presumption of, 126–31, 145, 153n19, 154n31
 - of rationality of means to achieve ends, 47–51, 52
 - Supreme Court as arbiter of, 14–15, 38–40
 - Supreme Court precedents as, 90
 - unprecedented and, 44–46
 - Volokh Conspiracy* and perception of uniform consensus about, 272–73
- Conyers, John, 188
- Cooter, Robert, 210, 211, 242–43
- “Cornhusker Kickback,” 9
- cost shift argument, 174, 175, 204–6
- courts of appeals
 - Anti-Injunction Act, 145
 - economic activity regulation in, 133, 153n21
 - individual mandate in, 117, 118–23, 126–31, 152
 - limits to decisions, 135
 - penalties vs. taxes, 133
 - political realm and decisions, ix, 117
- Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health*, 13, 174
- Cuccinelli, Ken, II, 2, 25, 259
 - See also *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, Supreme Court decision; *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius* in Supreme Court
- Dames & Moore v. Regan*, 262
- Darby, United States v.*, 66, 86, 100, 165, 227
- Daschle, Nathan, 32
- Davis, Andre M., 104
- Dellinger, Walter, 132, 173, 174
- DeMars, Jann, 120
- DeMint, Jim, 22
- Denniston, Lyle, 103–4, 106, 194
- dictum vs. holding, 237–38, 239–41
- direct evidence, 242
- direct taxes, 19–20, 103, 250
- district courts
 - decisions and trajectory to Supreme Court, vii–viii
 - economic activity, 83–84, 94
 - economic decisions doctrine in, 71
 - individual mandate in, vii–viii, 59, 71–72, 79, 83–85, 96–97
 - motions to dismiss, 59
 - penalties vs. taxes in, 71, 81, 84
 - political realm and appointments, viii, ix
 - political realm and decisions, 63
 - standing issue, 71–72
 - value of decisions, 63
- Dubina, Joel, 117, 157, 260
- Due Process Clause
 - circuit court decisions, 132, 135
 - commandeering and, 160
 - limiting principle and, 191
- duties, common law doctrine of, 109
- Easterbrook, Frank, 132, 135
- Eastern Enterprises v. Apfel*, 201
- Eastman, John, 194–95
- economic activity regulation
 - commandeering and, 162, 163
 - in courts of appeals, 133, 153n21
 - in district courts, 83–84, 94

- economic activity regulation (*continued*)
 economic decisions doctrine and, 62
 forcing entrance into market, 148–50
 interstate nature of health care, 46–47
Raich and, 11, 16, 136–37, 151
 Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 269–70
 Supreme Court definition of, 18
Wickard and, 73
- economic decisions
 under Commerce Clause, 60–61
 Congressional police power and acceptance of, 62
 in district courts, 71
 regulation, 93–94
 as slippery slope, 64–65, 73
Steeh and, 62, 64
- education law argument, 172–73
Edwards, Harry, 145
- effects test. *See* substantial effects rule
- Eleventh Amendment, 160
- emanations-and-penumbras arguments, 162–63
- ends (goals)
 constitutionality of means to achieve, 47–51, 55, 85
 Necessary and Proper Clause, 82–83
Engel, Steve, 183
Ensign, John, 22
- entitlements, repeal of, 27–28
- enumerated powers of Congress
 Affordable Care Act lies beyond, 10–12
 collective-action theory of federalism and, 210–12
Comstock and, 51
 indirect use of, 150
Lopez and *Morrison* and, 21
 militia, 36
 Necessary and Proper Clause, 84
 New Deal and, 274
 plenary powers vs., 76, 77
 powers granted besides, 82–83
 presumption of constitutionality and, 126–27
 state sovereignty and, 37
 Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 221–22, 258
- Epstein*, Richard, 22
- essential to a broader regulatory scheme doctrine, 87–88, 165–66
- European Union (EU), example of, 4
- event taxes, 20, 228–29
- Ex Parte Milligan*, 90
- Ex Parte Quirin*, 90
- facial challenges, 81
 individual mandate as, 167, 170
Roberts and as-applied vs., 249
Sutton and as-applied challenges vs., 119, 121–26, 132, 134–35
- Fallows*, James, 216
- Farr*, H. Bartow, III, 179
- federalism
 after New Deal, 100
 collective-action theory, 210–12
 commandeering and, 69–70, 140, 151
 federal prohibitions and, 69
 individual mandate as death of, 36–37
 judicial power in, 240
Kennedy on, 37, 67–68, 76
 plenary powers and, 76, 77
 regulations on states and, 69–70
 Supreme Court decision in *NFIB* as *victory*, 223–25
 Supreme Court make-up and, ix–x, 214
- Federalist No. 78, 198, 240
- Fifth Amendment, 160, 161, 191
- Filburn*, *Wickard v. See Wickard v. Filburn*
- first impression issue, 61–63, 64
- five-part test, 48–50, 52, 85, 94
- Flast v. Cohen*, 249
- Florida et al. v. Department of Health and Human Services* in Supreme Court, 157
 See also *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, Supreme Court decision; *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius* in Supreme Court
Florida v. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 59
- framer's intent, 4
- Fried*, Charles, 176, 274
- Fuller*, Lon, 161
- Fuller*, Melville, 189
- Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority (SAMTA)*, 81, 100
- Garwood*, William, 100
- general welfare, 81, 187, 194–95

- Gibbons v. Ogden*, 210
- Goldberg v. Kelly*, 90
- Gonzales v. Raich*
- activities are economic, 11, 16, 136–37, 151
 - activity/inactivity distinction and, 60–61, 80
 - as-applied challenges and, 166–67, 170
 - class of activities applied to, 125, 126
 - collective-action theory of federalism and, 211
 - extent of Congressional power, 67, 95, 96
 - individual mandate and, 15–19, 35–36, 71
 - intrastate activity, 86–87
 - substantial effects, 89
 - wrongly decided, 16–17, 21
- Graham, James, 118, 132
- Great Society, 34–35, 137–38
- Greenhouse, Linda, 170, 171–72, 174
- Griswold v. Connecticut*, 13
- “Guaranteed issue,” 10
- Gun-Free School Zones Act (GFSZA, 1990). See *Lopez, United States v.*
- Hall, Mark, 212
- Hamilton, Alexander, 198
- Hare, Phil, 188
- Hasen, Rick, 234
- health care
- bronze plans vs. catastrophic coverage, 205
 - Great Society, 137–38
 - insurance industry, 2, 12, 92, 93
 - as market, 19, 73–74
 - media coverage, viii
 - percent of US economy, 46
 - political realm and, 139
 - reform in Massachusetts, 31
 - right of refusal, 174
 - as special case argument, 94, 174–76, 183, 223–24
- Hein v. Freedom from Religion Foundation*, 249
- Heritage Foundation, 31–32, 138
- Hill, Frank, ix
- holding vs. dictum, 237–38, 239–41
- Hudson, Henry E., vii–viii, 45, 59, 65, 79, 83–85, 260
- Hull, Frank, 117, 157, 260
- indirect taxes, 20, 228–29
- individual mandate
- as Affordable Care Act pillar, 2, 10
 - activity/inactivity distinction and, 72–74, 120–21
 - arguments against constitutionality, 10–12
 - as bestowing plenary powers, 76
 - as commandeering individuals, 161–63
 - Commerce Clause and, 2–3, 22–23, 166, 189–90
 - cost shift argument, 174, 175
 - in courts of appeals, 117, 118–23, 126–31, 152
 - in district courts, vii–viii, 59, 71–72, 79, 83–85, 96–97
 - as economic stimulator, 92
 - as facial challenge, 167, 170
 - false arguments for, 173–75
 - federalism and, 36–37, 136, 189–91
 - health insurance companies and, 93
 - as intellectually indefensible, 228
 - as necessary and proper, 80, 238
 - as necessary but not proper, 94, 96–97, 181, 224
 - as noneconomic activity, 137
 - nonlegal arguments for, 206–9
 - penalties and, 71, 84, 179–80
 - political realm and, 158–59, 170–71
 - precedents for, 15–19, 33–34, 35–36, 39, 71
 - predictions about constitutionality, 29–31, 65, 182, 183, 214–15
 - public opinion about, 28, 168, 177, 271
 - purpose, 83
 - as rational means, 47–50, 80
 - as redistributive, 144
 - as Republican idea, 31–32, 138
 - right to privacy and, 13
 - single-pay system vs., 141–44
 - as slippery slope, 91–92, 118, 225–26
 - striking down as judicial activism, 203–4
- Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 222, 224, 236, 238, 239–41, 242, 244–49, 268–69
- as tax, 39, 84, 102–3, 190–91, 225–26, 242–43

- individual mandate (*continued*)
 as unprecedented, 45
 virtually everyone argument, 173–75
 interstate “hook,” 42–43
- Jackson, Andrew, 266
 Jackson, Robert, 148–49
 Jefferson, Thomas, 199
Johnson v. Eisentrager, 184
 Jost, Timothy Stoltzfus, 14–15, 45
 judicial activism, 201–4, 215–16, 222
 judicial conservatism, 207–9
 jurisdictional elements, 124, 126
- Kagan, Elena, 228, 269
 Katsas, Greg, 179–80
 Katyal, Neal, 106–8, 112, 125
 Kavanaugh, Brett, 145–46, 152
Kelo v. New London, 168, 185, 203, 206, 251
 Kennedy, Anthony
 actuarial risk questions, 192–93
 on federalism, 37, 67–68, 76
 health care as special argument and, 183
 individual mandate and, 224–25
 Lochner argument and, 200–201
 Vinson and, 99
 Kennedy, Ted, 9
 Kerr, Orin, 29–30, 34–35, 38, 40, 48–49,
 52–55, 65–67, 69, 75–76, 84–85, 95,
 98, 110–13, 128–31, 139, 143–44, 160,
 258–59, 273
 Kneeder, Edwin, 179
 Kopel, David B., 3, 34, 117, 185, 258, 261–
 62, 272
 Koppelman, Andrew, 91–92, 196, 212,
 263–64
- Landrieu, Mary, 188
 Langbein, John H., 1
Lawrence v. Texas, 200–201
 law reviews, 1
 Leahy, Patrick, 188
 legal academia, predictions from, ix, 29–
 31, 65, 182, 183, 195–97, 214–15
 legal duty, creation of, 109
 Levinson, Sandy, 35
 “libertarians are coming” meme, 209–10
 liberty, presumption of, 37, 191
 Liberty University, 71–72, 73
Liberty University v. Geithner, 59, 106–8,
 112
 Lieberman, Joe, 9
 limiting principles, 182–83, 189–91, 192–
 93, 196, 210–12, 274
 Lincoln, Abraham, 199
 Lithwick, Dahlia, 171–72
Lochner v. New York, 13, 200–201
 Long, Robert A., 179
Lopez, United States v.
 absence of limiting principle, 210
 application of Sutton reasoning to, 122,
 123–24
 collective-action theory of federalism
 and, 211
 Congressional powers and, 21, 66, 76,
 95, 164, 165
 federal authority regulatory limits, 32,
 80
 history, 30
 lower court decisions and, 30, 100–101
 presumption of constitutionality and,
 128
 rationality of means and, 18, 49–50
 regulation of noneconomic activity,
 11–12, 136
 Rehnquist opinion, 3, 86, 88, 164, 210
- Magliocca, Gerard, 44, 45, 46
 mandates
 activity/inactivity distinction and, 80,
 118
 heightened scrutiny for, 214
 as improper means under commerce
 power of Congress, 166
 Medicare as, 140
 popular will and, 81
 prohibitions vs., 105
 regulations vs., 21, 39–40, 42, 83
 as slippery slope, 150
 on states, 69–70
 Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 236,
 238
 as tax, 81, 116n55
 taxes in place of, 238
 upholding of, will be unprecedented, 46
 See also individual mandate
Marbury v. Madison, 228, 229
 marijuana legalization, 5
 See also Gonzales v. Raich

- market mechanisms, 2, 19, 73–74, 138,
140, 148–50
- Marshall, John, 116n55, 210, 228, 229, 262,
266
- Martin, Boyce, 118–19, 132, 133, 134–35,
153n21
- Maryland v. Wirtz*, 12
- Massachusetts health care reform, 31, 138
- Mathews v. Eldridge*, 90
- McCain-Feingold campaign finance
challenge, vii
- McCullum, Bill, 25
- McConnell, Michael, 33
- McConnell v. FEC*, vii
- McCullough v. Maryland*, 47–50, 86,
116n55, 228, 262, 266
- McDonald v. City of Chicago*, 132, 135
- McMaster, Henry, 25
- means to achieve goal, constitutionality of,
47–51, 52, 55, 85, 160
- media coverage, viii–ix
- Medicaid expansion, 3
as coercive to states, 169–70, 194, 226
Constitution preamble goals and, 187
general welfare definition, 194–95
Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 222–
23, 226, 236, 268, 269
- Medicare, 33, 39, 137–38, 140
- Meyer v. Nebraska*, 13
- Miers, Harriet, 232
- Militia powers, 36, 39
- Miller, Tom, 31–32
- Moon, Norman, 71–72, 73
- Morrison, United States v.*
application of Sutton reasoning to,
122–23
collective-action theory of federalism
and, 211
Congressional powers and, 21, 43, 66,
154n31, 164, 165
failure of Supreme Court to apply
rational basis test, 18
presumption of constitutionality and,
128, 129
regulation of noneconomic activity, 12
Rehnquist and, 3
- Most Democratic Branch: How the Courts
Serve America, The* (Rosen), 208
- motion to dismiss, 59
- Motz, Dianna, 106–8, 112
- NAMUDNO v. Holder*, 248
- Natelson, Rob, 10–11
- National Federation of Independent
Business (NFIB), 2
See also Vinson, Roger
- National Federation of Independent
Business v. Sebelius*, Supreme Court
decision
dissenting judges, 224–25
dissent wording, 233, 234
health care as special, 223–24
holding or dictum issue, 237–38, 239–41
individual mandate, 222, 224, 236, 238,
239–41, 242, 244–49, 268–69
legitimacy of Supreme Court and,
250–53
limits on federal power, 221–23, 235–36
Medicaid expansion, 268, 269
significance, 214–15, 235–37, 257–58,
268–70
taxing and spending power of Congress,
222, 225–26, 228–29, 245–48, 249–
50, 258, 269
- National Federation of Independent
Business v. Sebelius* in Supreme Court
actuarial risk questions, 192–93
agreement to hear, 157
briefs, 261–63, 265, 271
Kennedy and heightened scrutiny for
mandates, 214
oral arguments, 179, 271
public attention, ix
Roberts-Katsas dialogue, 179–80
Scalia-Verrilli dialogue, 181
Verrilli use of *Lochner*, 200–201
- National Labor Relations Act (1935), 213
- Necessary and Proper Clause, ix, 47–55
essential to a broader regulatory scheme
doctrine, 87–88, 165–66
individual mandate and limits, 189
individual mandate as necessary and
proper, 80, 238
individual mandate as necessary but not
proper, 94, 96–97, 181, 224
individual mandate as rational means,
47–50, 80
Kennedy in *Comstock*, 67–68
powers granted to Congress by, 82–83
rationality of means and, 47–50, 53–54,
57n44, 99

- Necessary and Proper Clause (*continued*)
- Scalia-Verrilli dialogue, 181
 - substantial effects rule, 88, 165
 - Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 222, 224, 228, 235–36, 269
 - wording, 14
- Nelson, Ben, 9
- New Deal
- constitutionality, 34–35
 - enumeration of powers and, 274
 - federalism after, 100
 - National Labor Relations Act
 - constitutionality, 213
 - popular will during, 27
 - substantial effects rule, 86
 - Supreme Court jurists, 229, 230, 232–33
 - See also specific cases*
- New England Journal of Medicine*, 26
- New Federalism, 165
- New York Times*, 72, 84, 216, 271
- New York v. United States*, 69, 140, 160, 211
- Ninth Amendment, 27, 37
- NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel*, 5, 42, 86, 87, 100
- noneconomic activity regulation, 86, 87–88
- individual mandate as, 137
 - necessity of collective solution, 210
 - Raich* and, 16
 - rulings against Congressional power, 11–12
 - Supreme Court definition of, 18
 - taxation, 26–27
- “Not the Power to Destroy: An Effects Theory of the Tax Power” (Siegel and Cooter), 242–43
- Obama, Barack, 2
- denial of individual mandate as tax, 39
 - importance of Affordable Care Act, 158–59
 - individual mandate as penalty, 102
 - legitimacy of judicial review, 197–200
 - priorities, 9
 - on Supreme Court decision, 236
- O’Connor, Sandra Day, ix, 160, 214
- omission as activity, 108, 109
- oral argument, 65
- in *Comstock*, 101
 - defining class of activities in, 125
 - in D.C. Circuit, 145–50
 - in Florida District Court, 94
 - in *Liberty University v. Geithner*, 106–7, 112
 - in Supreme Court, 157, 165, 167, 179, 180, 182, 186, 187, 189, 192, 194, 196–97, 206, 214
- originalism, 4, 38, 98–99, 207–9
- Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA). *See* Affordable Care Act (2010, ACA)
- Pelosi, Nancy, 10, 44, 188
- penalties vs. taxes
- Congressional powers and, 102–3
 - in courts of appeals, 133
 - in district courts, 71, 81, 84
 - Roberts-Katsas dialogue, 179–80
 - Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 245–48, 249–50, 269
 - Supreme Court decisions, 84, 103, 225–26
- Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 13
- Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 13
- plenary powers vs. enumerated powers, 76, 77
- police power, plenary
- acceptance of economic decisions doctrine, 62
 - Constitution withholds from Congress, 96
 - as inherent state power, 67, 150, 172
 - limiting principle, 182–83
 - Supreme Court in *Morrison*, 12
- political realm
- Affordable Care Act passage, 9–10
 - beliefs about constitutionality and, 171–72, 188, 270–71
 - courts of appeals decisions and, ix, 117
 - decisions and, 118
 - district court appointments and, viii, ix
 - district court decisions and, ix, 63
 - health care measures and, 139
 - Hudson refusal of motion to dismiss, 59, 65
 - individual mandate and, 158–59, 170–71
 - judicial activism and, 201–3
 - repeal of entitlements, 27–28
 - reversal of presidential agenda and, 184

- Supreme Court decisions and, 17, 28, 90, 91, 159, 207
- Supreme Court jurists, 229–30, 232–33, 237, 238
 - taxing power of Congress and, 140
- Posner, Richard, 132
- power, granting of, 6
- PrawfsBlawg*, 40, 41
- “precedent,” legal use of word, 41
 - binding nature of, 35, 97, 99
 - judicial activism and, 202, 215–16, 222
 - limiting principle and, 189
 - originalism vs., 98–99
 - use of, 90
- Predictions about constitutionality, ix, 29–31, 65, 182, 183, 195–97, 214–15
- preemptive challenges, 157
- presumption of constitutionality, 126–31, 145, 153n19, 154n31
- prices, 2, 10, 148–49
- Printz v. United States*
 - collective-action theory of federalism and, 211
 - commandeering and, 69, 140, 151, 165–66
 - means to achieve goal, constitutionality of, 160
 - necessary but not proper, 54–55
 - novelty claim, 162
 - presumption of constitutionality, 130, 131, 145
- prohibitions vs. mandates, 105
- “proper,” use of word, 49–50, 52, 54–55, 57n44, 238
- public opinion
 - changes in constitutionality and, 27
 - mandates and, 81
 - opinion about Affordable Care Act/individual mandate, 28, 168, 177, 206, 271
 - opinion about Supreme Court, 215, 251
 - Supreme Court decisions and, 28, 30–31, 35, 90, 91, 168, 177, 234, 271
- Rapanos v. United States*, 211
- Rasul v. Bush*, 184
- rational basis test, 16, 18, 47–51, 52
 - See also* substantial effects rule
- regulation(s)
 - of activity vs. of inactivity, 19, 72–74, 80, 106–7
 - conditional, 105
 - economic decisions doctrine and, 93–94
 - of inactivity, 118–19
 - includes prescription and proscription, 121
 - limits on, 32, 80
 - mandates vs., 21, 39–40, 42, 83
 - of requirement of action, 183
 - taxes as penalties, 84
 - See also* economic activity regulation; noneconomic activity regulation
- Rehnquist, William
 - background, ix
 - federalism and, 214
 - Lopez* and, 3, 86, 88, 164, 210
 - taxing and spending, 227
- Reid, Harry, 9
- Reorganized CF&I Fabricators of Utah, Inc., United States v.*, 84
- rescue, duty to, 104, 109
- right to privacy and individual mandate, 13
- ripeness issue, 61
- Rivkin, David, 11–15, 212–13, 259, 272
- Roach Motel theory, 132, 134
- Roberts, John
 - actuarial risk and, 193
 - background, ix–x, 232
 - Comstock* and, 52–53, 101–2
 - hints about changing *NFIB* vote, 233, 234, 241, 252–53
 - as judicial minimalist, 222
 - on law reviews, 1
 - as leader of activist court, 215–16, 222
 - questions on individual mandate as mandate, 179–80
 - severability issue, 249
 - taxing power upheld, 3
- Roberts, John, opinion in *NFIB*
 - as conservative, 231–32
 - as consistent with previous behavior, 248–49
 - individual mandate, 242, 244–49, 268–69
 - individual mandate as necessary but not proper, 224
 - limits on federal power, 221–22, 223–24, 235–36

- Roberts, John, (*continued*)
 logic of, 241–48
 significance of, 237–38
 taxing and spending, 225–26, 228–29,
 245–48, 249–50, 258
- Roberts v. United States Jaycees*, 90
- Roe v. Wade*, 11, 91
- Romney, Mitt, 31, 138, 230, 231
- Rosen, Jeffrey, 207, 208, 210
- Rosenkranz, Nick, 167
- Ruger, Ted, 176
- Sabri v. United States*, 47–50
- Sargent, Greg, 195
- “Saving construction” of Roberts, 241, 242,
 243, 244–49, 269
- Scalia, Antonin
Comstock dissent, 166
 individual mandate and, 224–25
Lochner used in *Lawrence* dissent,
 200–201
NFIB dialogue with Verrilli, 181
NFIB dissent, 228
Printz opinion, 54–55, 145, 160, 162,
 165–66
Raich concurrence, 21, 86–87, 89–90,
 165–67
- Schauer, Frederick, 91–92
- Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States*, 11
- Seaman Act (1798). *See* Act for the Relief
 of Sick and Disabled Seamen (1798)
- Sedgwick, Thomas, 26
- self-financing vs. self-insurance, 134
- Seven-Sky v. Holder*, 145–48
- severability issue, 59, 84–85, 94–95, 179,
 249
- Sex Offender Registration and Notification
 Act (2006, SORNA), 42–43
- Shapiro, Ilya, 126–27, 259
- Siegel, Neil, 189–91, 210, 211, 242–43
- Silberman, Laurence, ix, 145, 147–48
- single-payer system, 2, 138, 141–44
- slippery slope issues
 economic decisions doctrine, 64–65, 73
 individual mandate, 91–92, 118, 225–26
 mandates, 150
- Somin, Ilya, 3, 34, 50–52, 53, 61, 74–75, 77,
 96, 97, 117, 123, 127, 129–30, 134, 245,
 252, 258, 263
- Sonzinsky v. United States*, 26, 35–36, 103
- Sorrell v. IMS Health Care, Inc.*, 200
- South Dakota v. Dole*, 194, 222, 223, 227
- spending power of Congress, ix, 14
- standing issue, 61, 71–72, 249
- Stark, Fortney “Pete,” 188
- state sovereignty
 coercion and, 169, 194
 federal prohibitions and, 69
 federal regulations and, 69–70
 individual mandate as death of, 36–37
 Kennedy in *Comstock*, 67–68, 76
 limitations presupposed by
 Amendments, 160–61
 police power and, 67, 150, 172
 Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*,
 226–27
- Steeh, George C., III
 activity/inactivity distinction, 60–61,
 62, 72
 dismissal by, 59
 economic decisions doctrine, 62, 64
 first impression issue, 61–63, 64
 on health care as market, 73–74
- Steward Machine Company v. Davis*,
 227–28
- Stone, Harlan Fiske, 227
- subsidies, as Affordable Care Act pillar,
 2, 10
- substantial effects rule
 limits and, 3, 15–16, 88, 89
 as misguided, 17
 Necessary and Proper Clause, 165
 qualifications on, 86–87
- Supreme Court
 as arbiter of constitutionality, 14–15,
 38–40
 federalism and make-up of, 214
 legitimacy, 206–7, 250–53
 media coverage, viii–ix
 politics of jurists, 229–30, 232–33, 237,
 238
 public opinion about, 215, 251
 trajectory to, vii–viii, 65, 117
- Supreme Court decisions
 authority to determine constitutionality
 of statutes, 198–99
 collective-action theory of federalism,
 211
 deference to other branches and, 43–44,
 188, 228

- effect on public opinion, 215
 influence of lower court opinions, 132
 political realm and, 17, 28, 90, 91, 159, 207
 popular will and, 28, 30–31, 35, 90, 91, 168, 177, 234, 271
 presumption of constitutionality, 128
 Roberts court as activist, 215–16, 222
 use of word “proper” by, 49–50, 54–55, 57n44
See also specific cases
- Sutton, Jeffrey
 facial vs. as-applied challenges, 119, 121–26, 132, 134–35
 individual mandate and, 120–21
 legislative novelty, 133, 135
 political realm and decision by, ix, 117
 regulation of inactivity, 118–19
- SWANCC v. Army Corps of Engineers*, 211
- Taxing and Spending Clause, 60, 71, 85, 119, 194, 225–28, 237, 265
See also taxing power of Congress
- taxing power of Congress
 commandeering under, 163
 credits and, 39
 direct taxes, 19–20, 103, 250
 in district courts, 71
 extent of, 26–27
 form of law vs. function of law and, 231–32
 individual mandate and, 2–3, 39, 84, 102–3, 190–91, 225–26, 242–43
 mandates as tax, 81, 116n55
 noneconomic activity, 26–27
 penalty vs., 81, 84, 102–3, 133
 political restraints on, 140
 as power to destroy, 116n55
 Seaman Act as precedent, 33, 39
 spending power and, 14
 as superfluous, 119
 Supreme Court decision in *NFIB*, 222, 225–26, 228–29, 245–48, 249–50, 258, 269
 using in place of mandates, 238
- Teicholz, Adam, 184–85, 186
- Tenth Amendment, 14, 151, 160, 161, 166, 227
See also state sovereignty
- Third Amendment, 161
- Thirteenth Amendment, 161
- Thomas, Clarence, 96, 97, 166, 167, 224–25
- Thomas More Law Center, 59, 61
See also Steeh, George C., III
- Toobin, Jeffrey, 216, 248–49
- Turley, Jonathan, 36
- United Nations, jurisdiction of, 5
- United States Jaycees, Roberts v.*, 90
- United States v. Comstock*. *See Comstock, United States v.*
- United States v. Darby*. *See Darby, United States v.*
- United States v. Lopez*. *See Lopez, United States v.*
- United States v. Morrison*. *See Morrison, United States v.*
- United States v. Reorganized CF&I Fabricators of Utah, Inc.*, 84
- unprecedented issue, 40, 41–42, 44–46, 138–39, 172
- Verrilli, Donald B., Jr., 179, 187, 200–201
- vertical stare decisis, 37, 97, 99
- Vinson, Roger
 decision, 93–99, 260
 individual mandate as regulatory penalty, 71
 integration of individual mandate, 59
 refusal of motion to dismiss, 59
 trajectory to Supreme Court and, vii–viii
- Virginia v. Sebelius*, 88
- virtually everyone argument, 173–75
- Volokh, Eugene, viii
- Volokh Conspiracy (VC)*, viii, 1, 184–86, 270–73
- Walker, Wolf, 127
- Wall Street Journal*, 212–13
- Washington Post*, 25–26, 173, 174
- Washington Times*, 213
- Watson v. United States*, 128–29
- Whelan, Ed, 234
- White, Ed, 147–48
- Wickard v. Filburn*, 152
 activity/inactivity distinction and, 80, 120
 as-applied challenge and, 170
 collective-action theory of federalism and, 211

Wickard v. Filburn (continued)

- commodity vs. service, 12
- definition of economic activity, 73
- extent of Congressional power, 11, 96, 147–48
- individual mandate and, 35–36, 71

- Jackson opinion, 148–49
- Roberts’s opinion in *NFIB* and, 224
- substantial effects rule, 86
- window tax, 249–50
- Zywicki, Todd, 185