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In *No State Shall Abridge*, Michael Kent Curtis examines the historical underpinnings of a doctrine which is increasingly under attack as lacking historical support: the incorporation of the Bill of Rights by the fourteenth amendment. In its barest form, Curtis’s claim is that the framers of the fourteenth amendment intended that the states be bound to respect all of the individual liberties which, prior to the Civil War, had been protected against only federal invasion. According to Curtis, the framers expressed this thought not in the due process clause, but rather by providing that “[n]o State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.”

The argument that the fourteenth amendment incorporated the guaranties of the Bill of Rights and applied them to the states is not new. It came closest to being embraced by a majority of the Supreme Court in *Adamson v. California*. Justice Black’s dissent in that case included an extensive investigation of the congressional history of the amendment and concluded that incorporation was intended by the framers. Three of his brethren agreed. Two years later, however, an immensely influential article by Professor Charles Fairman appeared refuting Justice Black’s reading of history. Since that time many
commentators have conceded the historical debate to Fairman.9

Curtis, however, challenges that concession. Curtis expands the historical inquiry beyond the congressional debates to the entire historical context of the amendment, a crucial part of which was "the relation between the concern for the protection of civil liberties and the crusade to abolish slavery" (p. 29). The amendment, he asserts, was primarily a product of the Republican-led antislavery crusade which preceded the Civil War. Although this crusade had as its immediate aim the protection of black slaves in the South, it created a backlash hallmarked by repression of free blacks in the North and white abolitionists in the South (p. 31). In "declar[ing] an antislavery constitutional interpretation" (p. 6), the Republican framers were strongly influenced by what they regarded as the unconstitutional deprivation by many states of the fundamental liberties embodied in the Bill of Rights.

The debate over the effect of the fourteenth amendment, says Curtis, is "really a question of the meaning of language" (p. 12). However, he cautions that the language must be read in its historical context. Thus he proposes to interpret the amendment in light of its language, the abuses that produced it, the political and legal philosophy of those who proposed it, and the statements made by leading proponents in the congressional debates (pp. 12-13). After setting forth these ground rules for the interpretative quest, Curtis proceeds to examine each step in the amendment process.

Focusing first on the decades leading up to the Civil War (pp. 18-56), he notes that the denials of the rights of speech and press that resulted from attempts to silence abolitionists in the South effectively prevented the Republican party from campaigning there at all. Even in the North, the Supreme Court's decisions in the fugitive slave cases10 effectively prevented states from protecting the constitutional liberties of their own free black residents. This history convinced Republicans that "slavery [was] fundamentally incompatible with a free society. Its survival required eliminating the basic liberties of all citizens, white as well as black" (p. 36).

Armed with this understanding of the motivations of the various members of the Thirty-Ninth Congress, Curtis examines the congressional debates in meticulous detail (pp. 57-91). Here he finds coherence where others found only confusion. Curtis then analyzes some of the historical arguments against incorporation, criticizing Fairman and the modern proponent of his views, Raoul Berger,11 for failing to


11. Mr. Curtis has been engaged in an on-going debate with Professor Berger over incorporation. See R. Berger, Government by Judiciary: The Transformation of the Fourteenth Amendment (1977); Curtis, The Bill of Rights as a Limitation on State Authority: A
attach any significance to the fact that "[t]he Fourteenth Amendment was a Republican amendment. It was opposed by the mass of Democrats. But Fairman regularly found the Democrats to be the people who had a clear understanding of the Bill of Rights question. Republicans, he said, were confused" (p. 100; footnote omitted). Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. Curtis concedes that prevailing Republican legal thought could only be characterized as "unorthodox" (p. 52) in light of earlier Supreme Court pronouncements. 

As impressive as Curtis's historical evidence is, he is vulnerable to the charge that he relies on Republican statements of intent to the exclusion of all others. However, while Curtis draws little support from members of the Democratic minority, he compensates for this flaw to some extent by his citation to a wide variety of sources — from Blackstone (p. 64) to Cardozo (pp. 199-200) — for the proposition that the phrase "privileges and immunities" has been used before and after the drafting of the fourteenth amendment to include our most cherished rights. Certainly, this is what some of the Republicans meant, and none of the other congressmen challenged this interpretation. Thus, the argument is not simply that Republicans intended that the fourteenth amendment apply the Bill of Rights to the States, but that they said so by choosing language that any contemporary — even from the opposing party — would have understood to have that meaning.

12. Republicans repeatedly stated that the Bill of Rights prohibited certain state actions, in spite of the Supreme Court's conclusion to the contrary in Barron v. Baltimore, 32 U.S. (7 Pet.) 243 (1833).

13. P. 91. "John Bingham, the author of the amendment, and Senator Howard, who managed it for the Joint Committee in the Senate, clearly said that the amendment would require the states to obey the Bill of Rights. Not a single senator or congressman contradicted them. . . . Today, the idea that states should obey the Bill of Rights is controversial. It was not controversial for Republicans in the Thirty-ninth Congress." P. 91 (emphasis in original).

Curtis points out that it would be inaccurate to have used the phrase "Bill of Rights," because "the rights of American citizens include, but are not limited to, those in the Bill of Rights." P. 219. See also note 7 supra (discussing Justice Murphy's similar view expressed in his dissent in Adamson v. California, 332 U.S. 46, 124 (1947)).
In the remaining chapters, Curtis chronicles the treatment which the amendment received after it was drafted: before the states during ratification (pp. 131-53), in congressional attempts at enforcement (pp. 154-70), and before the courts (pp. 171-211). The events described in these later chapters provide further support for Curtis's arguments; however, they make the book considerably less readable without appreciably enhancing the cogency of the argument. This is the biggest problem with Mr. Curtis's otherwise excellent book. The main arguments of the book are supported and developed continuously throughout the book as Curtis moves laboriously through each stage of the drafting process. This choice of chronological rather than thematic organization relies too much on the sheer volume of Curtis's research and undervalues the importance of carefully structuring the arguments he advances. The result is that the considerable power of the thesis is at times obscured by the mass of evidence in its support. The chronological organization is probably unavoidable, but the thesis might have been communicated much more effectively if Curtis had spilled more ink in arguing from his evidence and less in merely presenting it.

Since the Supreme Court has "selectively incorporated" most of the privileges and immunities in the Bill of Rights anyway, one might reasonably question the relevance of the issue today. Curtis removes any such doubts by pointing to recent Supreme Court decisions holding the states to a lesser standard in securing the guaranties thus incorporated. "The fact that a growing body of political opinion is clamoring to free the states from federal protection of the guaranties of individual liberty contained in the Bill of Rights is a disturbing development" (p. 211).

If it is disturbing to Mr. Curtis, it is just as encouraging to the current Attorney General of the United States. As Professor William W. Van Alstyne points out in a Foreword to the book, Mr. Meese has recently urged repudiation of the doctrine of incorporation (pp. vii-x). Moreover, "[t]he fact is that Mr. Meese's point of view does not stand alone; it is no late Reaganite novelty, and it has troubled some of the most serious scholars (and judges) of our constitutional history" (p. ix).

If history is the field on which the interpretative battle will be
fought, then Mr. Curtis has made an invaluable contribution.\textsuperscript{16} Until now, few have taken issue on \textit{historical} grounds with the Attorney General's contention that "nothing can be done to shore up the intellectually shaky foundation upon which the \[incorporation\] doctrine rests" (p. viii). With \textit{No State Shall Abridge}, however, Mr. Meese should be on notice that scholars are rising to the challenge. As Curtis writes, "The Court can change direction — if it chooses — and allow states to violate the Bill of Rights. It cannot, however, justify this result by a fair reading of history" (p. 211).

— \textit{Mark A. Grannis}

\textsuperscript{16} Curtis acknowledges, however, that he is unlikely ever to gain an undisputed victory in the historical battle, due to the nature of historical inquiry: "In a real sense one can never prove that the amendment was designed to apply the Bill of Rights to the states. One can simply take the hypothesis and see how well it fits the evidence." P. 217.