Name	Period Date	
Unit 3: Lesson 21: What is Judicial Review? Why Is It Controversial?		
Judicial Philosophy:	is the set of and which dictate how <u>Justices</u> and <u>judges</u> of the <u>United States federal courts</u> may rule in many cases. Judicial: The belief that the Court should neither	
Judicial Restraint	overrule the decisions of elected officials nor make public policy (ex. <i>Plessy v. Ferguson</i> 1896) Upholding state law keeping federal out.	
VS.		
Judicial Activism	Judicial: a judicial ruling suspected of being based on or political considerations rather than on existing law (ex. Brown v. Board of Education 1954). Striking down law and imposing federal law and the Clause.	
What is judicial review?	The power of the judicial branch to decide if acts of the legislative or executive branches violate the Constitution	
Should the Supreme Court have the power to declare acts of the president and Congress unconstitutional?	The British Privy Council had the power to veto colonial legislatures laws. As well, state courts had declared laws made by state legislatures unconstitutional. The Constitution, however, makes no mention of the power of judicial review (read the first sentence of Article III). The judicial power shall be vested in whom?	
How did the Supreme Court establish the power of judicial review?	Although nothing in the clearly gives the Court this power, many historians believe that most of the Framers assumed that the courts would have this power.	
What events led to the Supreme Court case Marbury v. Madison?	In the election of Thomas Jefferson (Republican) defeated John Adams (Federalist) on Feb. 17 th , however, did not take office until March 4 th . While the were still in power they created numerous new judicial positions and Adams appointed his federalist cronies to those positions and the Federalist Senate approved them, including John to be the new Chief Justice of the Supreme Courtthese appointments became known as the " judges"	
What were the main issues in Marbury v. Madison?	Judicial commissions not delivered by Adam's Sec of State (Marshall) were then instructed not to be delivered by Jefferson's new Sec of State (James Madison). William Marbury who had been appointed justice of the peace for Wash. D.C. sued to force the delivery of his commission via a writ of (court order) from the Supreme Court forcing Madison to deliver his commission. Jefferson refused to allow Madison to deliver any of the commissions	

What was Marshall's decision?	Marshall's Dilemma: 1. The branch enforces the law, but what if Jefferson refused to follow the Court order? The Court would appear weak and powerless. 2. If the Court did not order the president to deliver the commission it would look regardless. Marshall solved the dilemma in an ingenious way by asking and answering the following 3 questions: 1) Does Marbury have a right to the appointment? YES or NOit had been signed by the president & sealed by the secretary of state, therefore, Marbury had a right to the office. 2) Do the laws of the country give Marbury a way to have things set right? YES or NOby refusing to deliver the commissions Madison was breaking the law and, therefore, Marbury should have a legal remedy. 3) Is asking the Supreme Court for a writ of mandamus the right legal remedy? YES or NOMarshall argued that the part of the Judiciary Act of 1789 that gave the Supreme Court the power to issue a writ of mandamus under original jurisdiction was unconstitutional. Marshall reasoned that by giving the Court a power the Constitution did not, Congress had violated the Constitution and, therefore, that portion of the Judiciary Act was null and void. So the Supreme Court did not order the delivery of the commission because they did not have the authority to do soMarshall avoided the almost certain embarrassment of having Jefferson refuse to obey the Court's order.
What was the significance of the Supreme Court's decision in Marbury v. Madison?	Marshall reasoned that when the people adopted the Constitution, they agreed that it would be the law of the land. Therefore, they had consented to be governed by its rules, which included certain limitations on the powers of C If the Court did not have the power of review, there would be no effective way to enforce the limitations placed on the powers of C The judiciary, therefore, is the of the Constitution.
Why has judicial review remained controversial?	Most Americans recognize review as a necessary power in our constitutional framework. The people do not always agree, however, on how the courts should use this power. The Supreme Court hears controversial cases on which Americans have strong feelings and either way the Court decides their will always be those who disagree.
What are the 4 methods used to interpret the Constitution?	Identify at least one problem with each method. 1. Using the literal meaning of the words in the Constitution Problem(s): 2. Intentions of those who wrote the Constitution Problem(s): 3. Using basic principles & values in the perspective of history Problem(s): 4. Using contemporary social values in terms of today's policy needs Problem(s):

Justices use all methods of interpretation. Justices also use courts have established in previous cases; current policy; political & concerns; and their personal political, economic, and beliefs. Despite all of these the justices are conscious of their responsibility to take an view of constitutional issues involved and not decide on the basis of their own views. How the public views the Court and its authority depends on its being faithful to both the language and of the Constitution.
1. How would not everlain the network of "indicial mation"?? How did the
1. How would you explain the power of "judicial review"? How did the Supreme Court acquire this power?
2. Why is Marbury v. Madison a historically important decision?
3. List the 4 different methods of interpreting the constitution?
4. Explain the idea that courts should be guided by "precedents" in deciding cases.