McDonald v. City of Chicago (2010)  
Argued: March 2, 2010 Decided: June 28, 2010

Directions: Read deliberately, waiting to make a decision on who you would side with on this case until after reading and highlighting or underlining all the information found below on this page and classifying arguments on the opposite page.   
  
Background:

The Second Amendment protects “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms,” but there has been an ongoing national debate about exactly what that phrase means. The debate only intensified after the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a handgun ban in the District of Columbia in 2008(*District of Columbia v. Heller*). Because of its unique constitutional status as the home of the federal government (and not a state), the District of Columbia is treated as subject to the restrictions that the Constitution places on the federal government. As a result, the *Heller* decision left open the question whether the Second Amendment applies to state and local governments. In this case, which is about a ban on guns in Chicago, the Court was presented with that question.

When the Constitution was written, the Bill of Rights applied only to the federal government—not to the state or local governments. After the Civil War, however, the Constitution was amended to include the 14th Amendment, which guarantees that the states shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. In the decades after the 14th Amendment, the Supreme Court began to rule that different parts of the Bill of Rights did apply to state and local governments—the process of selective incorporation. The Court said that some of the liberties protected in the Bill of Rights are *fundamental* to our concept of liberty and that it would violate the 14th Amendment’s guarantee of due process if states interfered with those liberties. Over time, the Court has ruled that almost all of the Bill of Rights do apply to the states. Before 2010, the Supreme Court had never ruled on whether the Second Amendment’s right to bear arms was one of those fundamental rights that states could not infringe.

Facts

In 1982, the city of Chicago adopted a handgun ban to combat crime and minimize handgun related deaths and injuries. Chicago’s law required anyone who wanted to own a handgun to register it. The registration process was complex, and possession of an unregistered firearm was a crime. In practice, most Chicago residents were banned from possessing handguns.

In 2008*,* after the Court decided *Heller* (see the summary below) and said that the Second Amendment includes an individual right to keep and bear arms, Otis McDonald and other Chicago residents sued the city for violating the Constitution. They claimed that Chicago’s handgun regulations violate their 14th Amendment rights. Specifically, the residents argued that the 14th Amendment makes the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms applicable to state and local governments.

The federal district court ruled for Chicago. McDonald appealed. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals decided for Chicago, as well. That court ruled that the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms protects individuals only from regulation by the federal government. McDonald asked the U.S. Supreme Court to hear the case, and it agreed to do so.

Constitutional Amendments

Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.”

14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law….”

Issue: Does the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms apply to state and local governments through the 14th Amendment and thus limit Chicago’s ability to regulate guns?

Directions: The following is a list of arguments from the court case. Read through each argument and decide which side it supports. Write (C) for the arguments that supports the City of Chicago's side and (M) for those arguments that supports Otis McDonald. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

\_\_\_\_1. **C/M** The Constitution and Bill of Rights have traditionally been understood as limits on the federal government, not the states.

\_\_\_\_2. **C/M** The ban obstructs the core right of keeping a common weapon, like a handgun, for protection in one’s home.

\_\_\_\_3. **C/M** Although an individual right to keep and bear arms that the federal government may not infringe, that decision did not prohibit states from controlling guns.

\_\_\_\_4. **C/M** Applying the Second Amendment to the states will not create a public safety crisis.

\_\_\_\_5. **C/M** Even if guns were an important part of this country at the time of the founding, much has changed since then. There is an ongoing national debate on guns and a variety of state approaches to gun control. The right to keep a handgun cannot be described as fundamental or an established American tradition that warrants incorporation.

\_\_\_\_6. **C/M** The Second Amendment affords American citizens the ability to defend themselves against a tyrannical government. It would not make sense to allow citizens to defend themselves against the federal government but not state or local governments.

\_\_\_\_7. **C/M** Most provisions of the first eight amendments already apply to the states, and the Second Amendment should not be treated differently. Rights articulated in the Bill of Rights are assumed to be fundamental.

\_\_\_\_8. **C/M** The right to keep and bear arms is not absolute.

\_\_\_\_9. **C/M** Chicago simply establishes procedures that residents must follow in order to possess a gun. Given the particulars of Chicago’s history of gun violence, the regulation is reasonable.

\_\_\_\_10. **C/M** The Chicago ban is nearly a total ban on gun ownership, and that is not reasonable.

\_\_\_\_11. **C/M** The Court should defer to state judgments regarding gun control. States and the cities within them each face their own particular public safety issues.

\_\_\_\_12. **C/M** The Second Amendment applies to the states because the right to keep and bear arms is deeply rooted in American history.

\_\_\_\_13. **C/M** Applying the Second Amendment to the states would likely strike down thousands of gun regulations across the country and create dangerous uncertainty for states and cities that face serious problems linked to guns.

\_\_\_\_14. **C/M** Possessing a gun is a right that pre-dates even the founding of the country, and guns are still an important part of American culture and liberty.

\_\_\_\_15. **C/M** States, like the federal government, should be able to impose some reasonable regulations to keep their citizens safe given that crime, injury, and death are all linked to handguns.

\_\_\_\_16. **C/M** The right to keep and bear arms is limited to weapons in common use and that traditional regulations that keep guns out of the hands of felons and out of places such as schools are not threatened by the Second Amendment.

*Which argument above did you find most compelling for the City of Chicago? Explain*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
  
*Which argument above did you find most compelling for Otis McDonald? Explain*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
 *If you were a Supreme Court Justice, how would you decide and why? Answer in 3-5 Sentences*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_