

3.3 Exercises

Supreme Court Cases In Exercises 1 and 2, complete the syllogism. Then draw a set diagram to represent the syllogism. (See Example 1.)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Premise: All unequal public schools are unconstitutional. • Premise: All segregated public schools are unequal. • Conclusion: _____
_____ | <p>2. <i>Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Premise: Any law that limits free speech is unconstitutional. • Premise: Any corporate spending on independent political broadcasts is free speech. • Conclusion: _____
_____ |
|---|--|

Marbury v. Madison In Exercises 3 and 4, use the excerpt from the Supreme Court’s majority opinion in the case *Marbury v. Madison*. (See Examples 1 and 2.)

“If, then, the courts are to regard the Constitution, and the Constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature, the Constitution, and not such ordinary act, must govern the case to which they both apply.”
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 177, 178 (1803)



3. Suppose the Constitution is superior to any ordinary law. Also suppose that an ordinary law conflicts with the Constitution. What conclusion can you draw?
4. Explain why the Constitution must be considered superior to any ordinary law for the Supreme Court to conclude that any unconstitutional law is illegal.

Supreme Court Cases In Exercises 5–8, write a syllogism that involves the Supreme Court’s decision. (See Examples 1 and 2.)

5. In *United States v. Virginia*, the Supreme Court held that the Virginia Military Institute’s male-only admission policy was unconstitutional because it treated women unequally.
6. In *Miranda v. Arizona*, the Supreme Court held that statements made by Ernesto Miranda were inadmissible because Miranda had not been advised of his Fifth Amendment rights before he made the statements.
7. In *Georgia v. Randolph*, the Supreme Court held that it was unconstitutional for police to search a house without a warrant if one resident consents but another resident objects.
8. In *Roper v. Simmons*, the Supreme Court held that the execution of an offender who was under 18 years old at the time of the crime was “cruel and unusual punishment” and therefore unconstitutional.