



Why
this c
of or
polic
tel sh
affir
liber
eral g
Scho
dyna
from
scien
purp
exec
and
of th
ican
Alar
for t
A se
"law
or tr
the
of E
199

tific
poli
Cor
tion

2. S
Schee
U.S.
Cont
U.S.

K
T
—
—
—
—
is
o
w
g
g
U
in
id
h
p
in
—
3.
br
m
ex
ar
in
ye
ha
pr
ag
pa
bu
ar
no
co
ar

who is given
ture is thus o
are not colle
pal-agent pr
ability, and r
control—a c
command, a
executives, th

Courts a
putes betwee
judge, sitting
Shapiro set
(1981), at th
between to n
in the contex
legitimacy. I
tion of a win
the dispute r
tution is thw
authoritative
(Shapiro 198

Courts)
includes con
For this reaso
creates a rule
that may ru
1999). Given
like that of t
ward when a
the applicati
at least incre
are perpetua
As Alexande
FORCE nor

4. See also Don
1977); Laura N
University Press
Review 89 (1976,

KER:

and
focu
ates
it is
poli
the
tum
judi

stru
of
pro
dev
ple
rea

nev
fro
int
sel
cat
dis
len
Ka
Ra
nat
of
inv

stit
dir
wh
as
bo
(Se
sit
an
as

KEP

All
inv
ent

wit
the
wh
ing
to
200
cor

Th
G.
cor
do
pol
doi
alw
of
rig
his
leg

Bau
ton

Car

Chr
128

Dw
Pre

Gra
Rev

KERSCH | The Distinct

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S.

Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113

Schachter Poultry v. U.S., 297

U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1

Wisconsin v. Ioder, 406 U.S.

Supreme Court

935)