

Identify The Constitutional Clause That Is Common To Both United States V. Nixon (1974) And Marbury V.

Identify The Constitutional Clause That Is Common To Both United States V. Nixon (1974) And Marbury V.

Introduction

The constitutional landscape of the United States is shaped by numerous clauses that define the scope and limits of governmental powers, rights, and responsibilities. Two landmark Supreme Court cases, United States V. Nixon (1974) and Marbury V. Madison (1803), stand out as pivotal in establishing essential principles of constitutional law—namely, the rule of law and the judiciary's authority to interpret the Constitution. While these cases address different issues—executive privilege and judicial review—they are unified by a fundamental constitutional principle: the supremacy of the Constitution and the authority of courts to interpret it. This article explores the constitutional clause that is common to both cases, examining how it underpins their rulings and shapes the American legal system.

Overview of United States V. Nixon and Marbury V. Madison

United States V. Nixon (1974)

Decided during the Watergate scandal, United States V. Nixon addressed the limits of executive privilege. The case involved President Richard Nixon's refusal to release tape recordings and documents subpoenaed by Congress, claiming executive privilege. The Supreme Court held that the President is not above the law, emphasizing that no person, not even the President, is constitutionally immune from judicial process in criminal cases. The ruling led to Nixon's resignation, reinforcing the principle that the judiciary can review and limit executive actions.

Marbury V. Madison (1803)

This case established the principle of judicial review—the power of the courts to declare laws unconstitutional. William Marbury petitioned for a writ of mandamus to compel the delivery of his commission as a justice of the peace. Chief Justice John Marshall's opinion articulated that it is the duty of courts to interpret the law and determine its constitutionality, thus affirming the judiciary's role as a co-equal branch of government.

The Constitutional Clause Connecting Both Cases

The Supremacy Clause

The key constitutional provision that unites both *United States V. Nixon* and *Marbury V. Madison* is the Supremacy Clause, found in Article VI, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution. The clause states:

- *"This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."*

This clause establishes the Constitution, federal laws, and treaties as the supreme law of the land, overriding conflicting state laws or executive actions. Both cases hinge on the principle that the Constitution and federal law are paramount, and the judiciary has the authority—and duty—to interpret and enforce this supremacy.

The Role of Judicial Review in Both Cases

Judicial Review as a Constitutional Principle

Although the term "judicial review" is not explicitly stated in the Constitution, it was established as a fundamental principle through *Marbury V. Madison*. The case confirmed that it is the judiciary's role to review laws and executive actions to ensure they comply with the Constitution.

Application in *Marbury V. Madison*

Chief Justice Marshall declared that it is "emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is." The decision set the precedent that courts could declare statutes unconstitutional, effectively asserting the judiciary's role as a co-equal branch and a guardian of the Constitution.

Application in *United States V. Nixon*

In the *Nixon* case, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the principle that no person, including the President, is above the law and that courts have the authority to review executive actions. The Court held that the President's claim of executive privilege was not absolute and that judicial review applies to executive confidentiality claims, especially when vital to the administration of justice.

The Intersection of the Supremacy Clause and

Judicial Review

How Both Cases Reinforce the Supremacy of the Constitution

Both cases exemplify the supremacy of the Constitution as the fundamental law binding all branches of government. The judiciary's authority to interpret the Constitution—grounded in the Supremacy Clause—serves as a check on executive and legislative actions.

Judicial Authority to Enforce the Supremacy Clause

The courts, through judicial review, ensure that laws and executive actions conform to the Constitution. In *Marbury*, the court declared a law unconstitutional, establishing judicial review. In *Nixon*, the court used its authority to limit executive privilege, affirming that the President is subject to the Constitution and the law.

Implications of the Common Constitutional Clause

Strengthening the Checks and Balances System

The shared reliance on the Supremacy Clause underscores the importance of the system of checks and balances. It demonstrates that no branch has absolute power and that courts can review and overturn actions inconsistent with the Constitution.

Ensuring Accountability and the Rule of Law

Both cases highlight that adherence to the Constitution is essential for accountability and the rule of law. The judiciary acts as a guardian, ensuring that all government actions remain within constitutional bounds.

Conclusion

The constitutional clause that is common to both *United States V. Nixon* (1974) and *Marbury V. Madison* (1803) is the Supremacy Clause of Article VI, Clause 2. This clause enshrines the Constitution, federal laws, and treaties as the supreme law of the land, guiding the judiciary's authority to interpret the law and review government actions. Both landmark cases exemplify the critical role of judicial review in maintaining the constitutional order, reinforcing the principle that all branches of government are subordinate to the Constitution. Through their rulings, these cases affirm that the judiciary has the ultimate authority to interpret the law and ensure that governmental actions conform to the supreme law of the land, thus safeguarding the principles of constitutional supremacy and the rule of law in American democracy.

Frequently Asked Questions

What is the constitutional clause that is central to both United States v. Nixon (1974) and Marbury v. Madison?

The Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, which establishes that the Constitution and federal laws take precedence over conflicting state laws and executive actions.

How does the Supremacy Clause relate to the rulings in United States v. Nixon and Marbury v. Madison?

In both cases, the courts emphasized the authority of the judiciary to review and uphold the Constitution, reinforcing that constitutional provisions, guided by the Supremacy Clause, supersede executive or legislative actions.

Why is the Supremacy Clause considered a common constitutional foundation in both landmark cases?

Because it affirms the judiciary's role in interpreting the Constitution and ensures that executive and legislative actions comply with constitutional principles, as upheld in both cases.

In what way did the courts invoke the Supremacy Clause in United States v. Nixon?

The Supreme Court held that executive privilege could not be used to withhold evidence in a criminal trial, asserting that the Constitution's supremacy limits executive authority.

How does the Supremacy Clause feature in the decision of Marbury v. Madison?

The Court established judicial review, asserting that it has the authority to strike down laws or executive actions that are unconstitutional, reinforcing the Constitution's supremacy.

Can you explain the role of the Supremacy Clause in establishing judicial review in Marbury v. Madison?

Yes, the clause underpins the Court's authority to declare laws unconstitutional, thereby affirming that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land, as demonstrated in Marbury v. Madison.

What common constitutional principle underpins the decisions in both United States v. Nixon and Marbury v. Madison?

The principle of the rule of law, supported by the Supremacy Clause, which ensures that all branches of government are bound by the Constitution and

that courts can interpret and enforce it.

Additional Resources

Constitutional Clause: A Deep Dive into Its Role in United States v. Nixon (1974) and Marbury v. Madison

Introduction

In the realm of American constitutional law, certain clauses serve as foundational pillars, shaping the judiciary's authority and defining the limits of executive power. Among these, the Supremacy Clause and the Judicial Review Doctrine are particularly prominent. When analyzing landmark cases such as United States v. Nixon (1974) and Marbury v. Madison (1803), a common thread emerges—a constitutional provision that underpins their significance and rulings. This article explores that shared constitutional element, examining its role, implications, and enduring influence on the American legal system.

The Shared Constitutional Foundation: The Supremacy Clause

What Is the Supremacy Clause?

Found in Article VI, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the Supremacy Clause states:

> "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."

This clause establishes the Constitution, federal laws, and treaties as the highest authority in the United States legal hierarchy. It ensures that state laws and constitutions are subordinate to federal law, creating a uniform legal framework across the country.

The Role of the Supremacy Clause in Landmark Cases

1. Marbury v. Madison (1803): Establishing Judicial Review

Background Overview:

- Marbury v. Madison is often heralded as the case that established the principle of judicial review—the judiciary's authority to examine laws and executive actions for constitutionality.

- The case arose when William Marbury petitioned for a writ of mandamus to compel the delivery of his commission as a justice of the peace, which had been withheld.

Connection to the Supremacy Clause:

- Chief Justice John Marshall's opinion emphasized that it is emphatically the duty of the judiciary to interpret the law and ensure that legislative and executive acts conform to the Constitution.
- Marshall invoked the Supremacy Clause to argue that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and it is the judiciary's role to uphold it, even if that means invalidating laws or executive actions that conflict with it.

Implication:

- The case reinforced that the judiciary has the ultimate authority to interpret the Constitution, and the Supremacy Clause provides the legal basis for this authority. It established that any law or executive act inconsistent with the Constitution is null and void, cementing judicial review as a core constitutional principle.

2. United States v. Nixon (1974): Affirming Federal Judicial Power

Background Overview:

- This case involved President Richard Nixon's attempt to withhold tape recordings and documents related to the Watergate scandal, asserting executive privilege.
- The Supreme Court unanimously held that the President is not above the law, and executive privilege does not grant absolute immunity from judicial process.

Connection to the Supremacy Clause:

- The Court's decision relied heavily on the Supremacy Clause, emphasizing that the Constitution's provisions and the rule of law take precedence over claims of executive privilege.
- The Court held that "the President is not above the law", and federal courts have the authority to review executive actions to ensure they comply with the Constitution.
- The case reinforced that all branches of government are subordinate to the Constitution, with the judiciary empowered to check executive power under the Constitution's supremacy.

Implication:

- It underscored that the Constitution and federal laws are supreme, and no individual, including the President, has unchecked authority. The case exemplifies the supremacy of the judiciary in upholding constitutional limits on executive power.

The Common Constitutional Clause: Judicial Review

While the Supremacy Clause explicitly establishes the hierarchy of laws, the concept of Judicial Review—the power of courts to examine laws and executive actions for constitutionality—is often regarded as an implied power derived from the Constitution and reinforced by the cases discussed.

Why is Judicial Review the shared element?

- Both *Marbury v. Madison* and *United States v. Nixon* revolve around the judiciary's authority to review and invalidate actions that conflict with the Constitution.
- *Marbury* explicitly established judicial review, asserting that courts have the authority to strike down unconstitutional laws.
- *Nixon* reaffirmed that the judiciary can review executive actions for constitutionality, especially when such actions conflict with the Constitution or federal law.

Why Are These Cases and the Clause Interconnected?

Aspect	Details	Significance
Judicial Review	The power of courts to invalidate laws and executive actions that contravene the Constitution.	This power is fundamental in maintaining the rule of law and preserving constitutional supremacy.
Supremacy of the Constitution	The Constitution is the highest legal authority. It underpins judicial review and affirms the judiciary's role in interpreting the law.	
Checks and Balances	The judiciary acts as a check on legislative and executive branches. Both cases exemplify this principle— <i>Marbury</i> through establishing judicial review, <i>Nixon</i> through enforcing the rule of law against the executive.	

The Impact on American Constitutional Law

1. Clarification of Judicial Power

- *Marbury v. Madison* set the precedent that courts have the authority to review and nullify unconstitutional laws.
- *United States v. Nixon* demonstrated that even the President is subject to judicial review, reinforcing the principle that no one is above the law.

2. Reinforcement of the Constitutional Framework

- The cases reinforce the importance of the Supremacy Clause in maintaining federal constitutional supremacy.
- They exemplify how judicial review operates within the constitutional hierarchy, ensuring that all government actions conform to constitutional limits.

3. Strengthening the Rule of Law

- Both cases underscore that the rule of law is paramount, and constitutional provisions like the Supremacy Clause serve as the legal backbone for this principle.

Key Takeaways for Legal Scholars and Students

- The Supremacy Clause is central to understanding the judiciary's power in the U.S. constitutional system, serving as the legal foundation for judicial review.
- Both Marbury and Nixon exemplify the judiciary's role in upholding the Constitution as the supreme law of the land.
- These cases demonstrate that no branch of government is above the Constitution, fostering a balanced governmental framework.
- The concept of Judicial Review—though not explicitly stated in the Constitution—has become an essential element of constitutional law, reinforced through landmark judicial decisions.

Final Thoughts

The Constitutional Clause shared by *United States v. Nixon* and *Marbury v. Madison* is arguably the Supremacy Clause, a fundamental component that underpins the judiciary's authority to interpret the law and uphold the Constitution. Its role is not just procedural but profoundly transformative, establishing the judiciary as a co-equal branch capable of checking legislative and executive excesses. These landmark cases serve as enduring testaments to the power of this clause, shaping the American legal landscape and safeguarding the principles of justice, rule of law, and constitutional supremacy for generations to come.

Identify The Constitutional Clause That Is Common To Both United States V Nixon 1974 And Marbury V

Identify The Constitutional Clause That Is Common To Both United States V Nixon 1974 And Marbury V

Related Articles

- [If A Repeat Car Buyer Did Not Purchase A Car Made By A U.s. Manufacturer On Their Prior Purchase, What](#)
- [How Do Monopolies Benefit The Economy?They Do Not Compete With Foreign Companies, Which Causes Them To](#)
- [Imagine That You Wake Up One Day And Discover That You Are Invisible Write A Story About What Happened](#)

[Back to Home](#)