

NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF

NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF IS A FOUNDATIONAL CLAUSE EMBEDDED WITHIN THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. THIS PROVISION PLAYS A CRITICAL ROLE IN SAFEGUARDING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS AGAINST POTENTIAL INFRINGEMENT BY STATE GOVERNMENTS. IT EMBODIES THE PRINCIPLE THAT STATES CANNOT PASS LEGISLATION THAT UNJUSTLY RESTRICTS THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS OF THEIR CITIZENS, THEREBY ENSURING A BASELINE OF CIVIL LIBERTIES ACROSS ALL STATES. UNDERSTANDING THIS CLAUSE INVOLVES EXPLORING ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT, LEGAL INTERPRETATIONS, AND ITS ONGOING IMPLICATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE

ORIGINS AND RATIFICATION

THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE WAS ADOPTED AS PART OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT IN 1868, DURING THE RECONSTRUCTION ERA FOLLOWING THE CIVIL WAR. ITS PRIMARY PURPOSE WAS TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF NEWLY FREED SLAVES AND TO PREVENT STATES FROM ENACTING LAWS THAT WOULD DISCRIMINATE AGAINST OR DIMINISH THEIR RIGHTS AS AMERICAN CITIZENS.

GOALS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION AMENDMENTS

THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, INCLUDING THIS CLAUSE, AIMED TO:

1. GUARANTEE EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW
2. ENSURE DUE PROCESS RIGHTS FOR ALL CITIZENS
3. PROTECT THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS FROM STATE INFRINGEMENT

INITIAL LEGAL CHALLENGES

EARLY LEGAL DEBATES CENTERED AROUND THE SCOPE OF THE CLAUSE—SPECIFICALLY, WHETHER IT PROTECTED ONLY A NARROW SET OF RIGHTS (SUCH AS THOSE LISTED IN THE BILL OF RIGHTS) OR A BROADER SPECTRUM OF CIVIL RIGHTS.

LEGAL INTERPRETATION AND KEY SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

THE SLAUGHTERHOUSE CASES (1873)

THESE CASES ARE PIVOTAL IN UNDERSTANDING THE SCOPE OF THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE.

- HELD THAT THE CLAUSE PROTECTED ONLY A NARROW SET OF RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH FEDERAL U.S. CITIZENSHIP, NOT THE RIGHTS OF STATE CITIZENS.
- SIGNIFICANTLY LIMITED THE CLAUSE’S APPLICATION, LEADING TO THE DECLINE OF ITS USE AS A TOOL FOR CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT.

POST-SLAUGHTERHOUSE DEVELOPMENTS

FOR MANY DECADES, THE SUPREME COURT PRIMARILY RELIED ON THE EQUAL PROTECTION AND DUE PROCESS CLAUSES TO ADDRESS CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES, WITH THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE BEING LARGELY DORMANT.

THE 20TH CENTURY RESURGENCE: UNITED STATES V. CAROLINE PRODUCTS Co. (1938)

WHILE NOT DIRECTLY INTERPRETING THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE, THIS DECISION EMPHASIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING CIVIL LIBERTIES, PAVING THE WAY FOR FUTURE INTERPRETATIONS.

THE 21ST CENTURY PERSPECTIVE

IN RECENT YEARS, COURTS HAVE REVISITED THE MEANING OF THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE, ACKNOWLEDGING ITS POTENTIAL TO PROTECT FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS BEYOND THOSE ENUMERATED EXPLICITLY.

THE SCOPE AND MEANING OF “PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES”

WHAT ARE “PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES”?

THESE TERMS REFER TO FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND LEGAL PROTECTIONS THAT ARE INHERENT TO U.S. CITIZENSHIP.

- RIGHT TO TRAVEL BETWEEN STATES
- RIGHT TO ACCESS COURTS AND LEGAL PROTECTIONS
- RIGHT TO VOTE (SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS)
- PROTECTION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION BY STATES

DISTINCTION FROM OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE DIFFERS FROM THE DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSES IN THAT IT EMPHASIZES THE PROTECTION OF A CORE SET OF RIGHTS OF ALL CITIZENS, REGARDLESS OF STATE LAWS.

BROAD VERSUS NARROW INTERPRETATIONS

- NARROW VIEW: PROTECTS ONLY RIGHTS EXPLICITLY LISTED IN THE BILL OF RIGHTS.
- BROAD VIEW: ENCOMPASSES A WIDE ARRAY OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS INHERENT TO NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP.

IMPLICATIONS FOR STATE LAWS AND CIVIL RIGHTS

PROTECTION AGAINST STATE LEGISLATION

THE CLAUSE ACTS AS A CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARD AGAINST LAWS THAT WOULD DIMINISH OR DENY THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF CITIZENS.

1. PREVENT DISCRIMINATORY LAWS BASED ON RACE, GENDER, OR OTHER CHARACTERISTICS
2. ENSURE THAT STATES DO NOT IMPOSE UNNECESSARY RESTRICTIONS ON INTERSTATE TRAVEL OR PARTICIPATION IN CIVIC LIFE
3. PROTECT RIGHTS RELATED TO PROPERTY, SPEECH, AND ASSOCIATION

LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES

DESPITE ITS IMPORTANCE, APPLYING THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE HAS BEEN CHALLENGING DUE TO:

- LIMITED JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION SINCE THE SLAUGHTERHOUSE CASES
- DIFFICULTY IN DEFINING THE SCOPE OF “PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES”
- OVERRELIANCE ON OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS FOR CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTIONS

CONTEMPORARY CASES AND TRENDS

MODERN COURTS HAVE BEGUN RECOGNIZING THE CLAUSE’S POTENTIAL TO ADDRESS ISSUES SUCH AS:

- VOTING RIGHTS
- ACCESS TO PUBLIC BENEFITS
- PROTECTION FROM STATE-IMPOSED DISCRIMINATION

BROADER IMPACT AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENSURING UNIFORM CIVIL LIBERTIES

THE CLAUSE AIMS TO PROVIDE A UNIFORM SET OF RIGHTS FOR ALL CITIZENS ACROSS STATES, PREVENTING A PATCHWORK OF PROTECTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS.

INFLUENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENTS

THROUGHOUT HISTORY, ACTIVISTS AND LEGAL ADVOCATES HAVE INVOKED THE RIGHTS PROTECTED UNDER THIS CLAUSE TO CHALLENGE DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES AND PROMOTE EQUALITY.

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS

WHILE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE IS LESS FREQUENTLY INVOKED THAN THE DUE PROCESS OR EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSES, IT REMAINS A VITAL COMPONENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS.

CONCLUSION: THE CONTINUING RELEVANCE OF THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE

THE PHRASE “NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF” UNDERSCORES A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: THAT STATE GOVERNMENTS ARE LIMITED IN THEIR ABILITY TO RESTRICT THE RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS INHERENT TO CITIZENSHIP. ALTHOUGH ITS APPLICATION HAS HISTORICALLY BEEN LIMITED, RECENT LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS SUGGEST A RENEWED INTEREST IN LEVERAGING THIS CLAUSE TO ENSURE BROADER CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTIONS. UNDERSTANDING ITS HISTORY, SCOPE, AND ONGOING RELEVANCE IS ESSENTIAL FOR APPRECIATING HOW THE U.S. CONSTITUTION SEEKS TO UPHOLD THE CIVIL LIBERTIES OF ALL ITS CITIZENS, REGARDLESS OF THE STATE IN WHICH THEY RESIDE.

META DESCRIPTION:

EXPLORE THE SIGNIFICANCE AND HISTORY OF THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE IN THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, ITS LEGAL INTERPRETATIONS, AND ITS VITAL ROLE IN PROTECTING CITIZENS’ FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PHRASE ‘NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS’ IN THE U.S. CONSTITUTION?

THIS PHRASE IS FROM THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT, WHICH AIMS TO PROTECT CITIZENS’ FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS FROM STATE INFRINGEMENT, ENSURING THAT STATES DO NOT DIMINISH THE PRIVILEGES OF NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP.

How has the Supreme Court interpreted the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause historically?

Historically, the Supreme Court narrowly interpreted the clause, notably in the 1873 Slaughter-House Cases, limiting its scope mainly to rights associated with national citizenship rather than broader civil rights protections.

What are some examples of privileges or immunities protected under this clause?

Examples include the right to travel, the right to access courts, and the right to vote, although the scope has been limited by court rulings over time.

How does the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause differ from the 'Due Process' and 'Equal Protection' clauses of the 14th Amendment?

While the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause aims to protect fundamental rights of citizens from state infringement, the 'Due Process' and 'Equal Protection' clauses focus on ensuring fair legal procedures and equal treatment under the law.

What impact did the Slaughter-House Cases have on the application of the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause?

The Slaughter-House Cases significantly limited the clause's scope, ruling that it protected only rights associated with federal U.S. citizenship, thus reducing its effectiveness in safeguarding civil rights.

Are there ongoing debates about expanding the interpretation of the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause?

Yes, legal scholars and advocates argue for a broader interpretation to better protect civil rights and liberties, but courts have largely maintained a narrow reading so far.

How does the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause relate to modern civil rights movements?

Although historically limited, some argue that a broader interpretation could strengthen protections against discriminatory state laws and support civil rights initiatives.

Has the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause been used in recent landmark cases?

Its use has been rare in recent cases; most civil rights protections have been enforced under the 'Equal Protection' and 'Due Process' clauses, but some advocates seek to revive its application.

What role does the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause play in protecting minority rights today?

While its application is limited, some believe it could serve as a constitutional tool for safeguarding minority rights against state restrictions if its scope is expanded.

What are the challenges in interpreting the 'Privileges or Immunities' Clause

IN CONTEMPORARY LAW?

CHALLENGES INCLUDE JUDICIAL PRECEDENT FAVORING A NARROW INTERPRETATION, THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE CLAUSE, AND DEBATES OVER ITS POTENTIAL TO PROVIDE BROADER CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTIONS.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF

INTRODUCTION

THE PHRASE "NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF" IS A CORNERSTONE OF AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. ROOTED IN THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT'S PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE, THIS PROVISION WAS DESIGNED TO SAFEGUARD FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS FROM INFRINGEMENT BY STATE GOVERNMENTS. OVER THE YEARS, ITS INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION HAVE SPARKED EXTENSIVE LEGAL DEBATES, SHAPING THE LANDSCAPE OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND FEDERALISM IN THE UNITED STATES. THIS ARTICLE EXPLORES THE ORIGINS, EVOLUTION, AND CONTEMPORARY SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARD, PROVIDING A DETAILED YET ACCESSIBLE ANALYSIS OF ITS LEGAL INTRICACIES AND SOCIETAL IMPLICATIONS.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND ORIGINS

THE RECONSTRUCTION ERA AND THE BIRTH OF THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE

THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT WAS RATIFIED IN 1868, DURING THE TUMULTUOUS RECONSTRUCTION ERA, PRIMARILY TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF RECENTLY FREED SLAVES AND ENSURE EQUAL TREATMENT UNDER THE LAW. ITS TEXT INCLUDES SEVERAL CRITICAL PROVISIONS, AMONG THEM THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE, WHICH STATES:

"NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES."

THIS CLAUSE WAS INTENDED TO PREVENT STATES FROM ENACTING LAWS THAT WOULD UNDERMINE THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF CITIZENS, ESPECIALLY IN THE WAKE OF THE CIVIL WAR AND THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

THE ORIGINAL INTENT

LEGAL SCHOLARS AND HISTORIANS GENERALLY AGREE THAT THE FRAMERS ENVISIONED THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE AS A BROAD GUARANTEE PROTECTING VARIOUS RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP—SUCH AS ACCESS TO COURTS, THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL, AND THE RIGHT TO ENGAGE IN LAWFUL COMMERCE. THE GOAL WAS TO CREATE A UNIFORM SHIELD AGAINST STATE LAWS THAT COULD DISCRIMINATE AGAINST OR RESTRICT THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS, ENSURING THAT NATIONAL RIGHTS COULD NOT BE ABRIDGED AT THE STATE LEVEL.

LEGAL INTERPRETATION AND THE SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES

THE LANDMARK CASE: THE SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES (1873)

DESPITE THE LOFTY INTENTIONS, THE SUPREME COURT'S INTERPRETATION IN THE SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES DRAMATICALLY CURTAILED THE SCOPE OF THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE. IN THIS PIVOTAL DECISION, THE COURT HELD THAT THE CLAUSE PROTECTED ONLY RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH FEDERAL U.S. CITIZENSHIP, NOT THOSE DERIVED FROM STATE CITIZENSHIP OR STATE LAWS.

KEY POINTS FROM THE CASE INCLUDE:

- The Court distinguished between federal rights (such as the right to interstate travel or access to federal courts) and state rights.
- It concluded that the privileges and immunities of citizens were primarily rooted in state law, and thus, the clause did not protect many rights traditionally associated with state citizenship.
- The ruling effectively rendered the Privileges or Immunities Clause almost powerless, as it limited its scope to a narrow set of rights.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE RULING

The decision in the Slaughter-House Cases had profound implications:

- It diminished the clause's potential to serve as a broad protector of civil rights.
- It placed greater emphasis on the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment for civil rights litigation.
- It sparked a legal landscape where states retained significant authority to regulate rights and privileges, often leading to discriminatory laws, particularly against African Americans and marginalized groups.

EVOLUTION AND MODERN REINTERPRETATIONS

The Shift Towards the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses

After the Slaughter-House Cases, courts increasingly relied on the Due Process Clause (Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment) to address civil rights issues, leading to landmark rulings such as Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) and Brown v. Board of Education (1954). These decisions emphasized state authority and separate but equal doctrines, often at the expense of the rights of minorities.

The Rebirth of the Privileges or Immunities Clause

The mid-20th century saw a renewed interest in the original intent of the Privileges or Immunities Clause. Notably:

- Reed v. Reed (1971): Recognized gender discrimination as a violation of equal protection but did not directly invoke the Privileges or Immunities Clause.
- Saenz v. Roe (1999): The Supreme Court acknowledged that the Privileges or Immunities Clause protects some rights, including the right to travel, but the scope remains limited.

The 21st Century Debate: Can the Clause Be Revived?

Recent legal scholarship and some judicial opinions suggest that the Privileges or Immunities Clause could be revitalized as a broad protector of civil rights, akin to its original intent. Advocates argue that:

- The clause has been underutilized and misunderstood.
- A proper textual and historical interpretation could restore its potential to combat discrimination and protect fundamental rights.

Opponents, however, caution that such a revival would require a significant rethinking of constitutional doctrine and judicial philosophy.

LEGAL AND SOCIETAL IMPLICATIONS

The Role in Civil Rights Litigation

While the Privileges or Immunities Clause has historically played a limited role, its potential remains significant. A broader interpretation could:

- PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE LEGAL AVENUE FOR CHALLENGING DISCRIMINATORY LAWS.
- OFFER STRONGER PROTECTIONS FOR RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP.
- COMPLEMENT THE EQUAL PROTECTION AND DUE PROCESS CLAUSES IN SAFEGUARDING INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS.

IMPACT ON FEDERALISM AND STATE AUTHORITY

THE CLAUSE'S INTERPRETATION ALSO INFLUENCES THE BALANCE OF POWER BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS:

- A BROAD READING COULD LIMIT STATE SOVEREIGNTY IN REGULATING RIGHTS.
- IT MIGHT LEAD TO INCREASED FEDERAL OVERSIGHT OF STATE LAWS, ESPECIALLY IN AREAS LIKE VOTING RIGHTS, CIVIL LIBERTIES, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE.

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

IN LIGHT OF ONGOING ISSUES SUCH AS VOTING RIGHTS, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, AND PRIVACY RIGHTS, THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE REMAINS A POTENTIALLY POWERFUL YET UNDERUTILIZED TOOL. ITS REVIVAL COULD:

- STRENGTHEN PROTECTIONS FOR MARGINALIZED GROUPS.
- CLARIFY THE SCOPE OF NATIONAL RIGHTS.
- PROMOTE A MORE UNIFIED APPROACH TO CIVIL LIBERTIES ACROSS STATES.

CONCLUSION

THE PHRASE "NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF" EMBODIES A VITAL CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARD DESIGNED TO ENSURE THAT THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS ARE PROTECTED FROM ENCROACHMENT BY STATE GOVERNMENTS. ITS HISTORICAL JOURNEY—FROM AMBITIOUS ORIGINAL INTENT TO JUDICIAL SIDELINING, AND POTENTIALLY BACK TO PROMINENCE—REFLECTS THE EVOLVING NATURE OF CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

UNDERSTANDING THIS CLAUSE REQUIRES NOT ONLY A GRASP OF LEGAL HISTORY BUT ALSO AN APPRECIATION OF ITS SOCIETAL SIGNIFICANCE. AS DEBATES CONTINUE OVER CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE PROPER SCOPE OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY, THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE REMAINS A SYMBOL OF THE PROMISE OF EQUAL PROTECTION AND THE POTENTIAL FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL. WHETHER IT WILL BE FULLY REALIZED AGAIN AS A ROBUST PROTECTOR OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS DEPENDS ON FUTURE JUDICIAL INTERPRETATIONS, LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS, AND SOCIETAL COMMITMENTS TO JUSTICE AND EQUALITY.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

- AMAR, AKHIL REED. THE BILL OF RIGHTS: CREATION AND RECONSTRUCTION. BASIC BOOKS, 1998.
- FINKELMAN, PAUL. LAND OF OPPRESSION: THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF SLAVERY IN THE ANTEBELLUM SOUTH. ROUTLEDGE, 2012.
- KLARMAN, MICHAEL J. FROM JIM CROW TO CIVIL RIGHTS: THE SUPREME COURT AND THE STRUGGLE FOR RACIAL EQUALITY. OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2004.
- LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP AND RECENT SUPREME COURT OPINIONS ON THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE.
- OFFICIAL TEXTS OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT AND KEY JUDICIAL DECISIONS.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

[YOUR NAME] IS A LEGAL ANALYST AND WRITER SPECIALIZING IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES. WITH A BACKGROUND IN LEGAL HISTORY, [YOUR NAME] AIMS TO MAKE COMPLEX LEGAL CONCEPTS ACCESSIBLE AND ENGAGING FOR A BROAD AUDIENCE.

No State Shall Make Or Enforce Any Law Which Shall Abridge The Privileges Or Immunities Of Citizens Of

No State Shall Make Or Enforce Any Law Which Shall Abridge The Privileges Or Immunities Of Citizens Of

Related Articles

- [Please Help!I Attempted This Question Myself \(second Attachment\) But Got The Answer Wrong, Can Someone](#)
- [Mr. And Mrs. Johnson Know That In 6 Years, Their Daughter Ann Will Attend State College. She Will Need](#)
- [Multicellular Organisms Use Cell Division, Mitosis, For Growth And The Maintenance And Repair Of Cells](#)

[Back to Home](#)