

William & Mary Law Review

Volume 39 (1997-1998)
Issue 3

Article 1

March 1998

Table of Contents (v. 39, no. 3)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr>

Repository Citation

Table of Contents (v. 39, no. 3), 39 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. (1998), <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr/vol39/iss3/1>

Copyright c 1998 by the authors. This article is brought to you by the William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository.
<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr>

William and Mary Law Review

Volume 39

No. 3, 1998

Symposium: Reflections on *City of Boerne v. Flores*

THE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM RESTORATION ACT IS A CONSTITUTIONAL EXPANSION OF RIGHTS	<i>Erwin Chemerinsky</i>	601
RFRA	<i>David P. Currie</i>	637
HOW NOT TO CHALLENGE THE COURT	<i>Neal Devins</i>	645
THE FEDERALISM IMPLICATIONS OF <i>FLORES</i>	<i>Stephen Gardbaum</i>	665
WHY NOW IS NOT THE TIME FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT: THE LIMITED REACH OF <i>CITY OF BOERNE V. FLORES</i>	<i>Kent Greenawalt</i>	689
<i>CITY OF BOERNE V. FLORES</i> : A LANDMARK FOR STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS	<i>Marci A. Hamilton</i>	699
TWO SECTION TWOS AND TWO SECTION FIVES: VOTING RIGHTS AND REMEDIES AFTER <i>FLORES</i>	<i>Pamela S. Karlan</i>	725
CONCEPTUAL GULFS IN <i>CITY OF BOERNE V. FLORES</i>	<i>Douglas Laycock</i>	743
WHY THE CONGRESS WAS WRONG AND THE COURT WAS RIGHT—REFLECTIONS ON <i>CITY OF BOERNE V. FLORES</i>	<i>Ira C. Lupu</i>	793
FREEDOM FROM PERSECUTION OR PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE?: A CRITIQUE OF JUSTICE SCALIA'S HISTORICAL ARGUMENTS IN <i>CITY OF BOERNE V. FLORES</i>	<i>Michael W. McConnell</i>	819
JUDICIAL SUPREMACY AND THE SETTLEMENT FUNCTION	<i>Robert F. Nagel</i>	849

JUSTICE O'CONNOR'S DILEMMA: THE BASELINE QUESTION	<i>Suzanna Sherry</i>	865
LOSING JERUSALEM—RFRA AND THE VOCATION OF LEGAL CRUSADER	<i>Steven D. Smith</i>	907
THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION AFTER THE FALL: THE CASE FOR INTERMEDIATE SCRUTINY	<i>Rodney A. Smolla</i>	925
TWO VERSIONS OF JUDICIAL SUPREMACY	<i>Mark Tushnet</i>	945
NOTES		
THE CURRENT STATE OF THE PEREMPTORY CHALLENGE		961
AD HOC ADJUDICATION: <i>PEOPLE V. CHAMPION</i> , ANOTHER CONFUSING ELEMENT IN THE TURMOIL FOLLOWING <i>MINNESOTA V. DICKERSON</i>		1003