THE MADISONIAN SEPARATION OF POWERS OBJECTIVE COMPLIANCE TEST: RECOVERING CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE THROUGH TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Joseph D. Kirchner
Independent Scholar
February 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 8
PART I: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION 12
I. INTRODUCTION 12
A. The 239-Year Gap 12
B. The Life-and-Death Urgency 15
C. Thesis and Roadmap 16
PART II: THE MADISONIAN FRAMEWORK 19
II. THE MADISONIAN FRAMEWORK 19
A. "Distribution" Not "Separation" 19
B. "Balance and Check" as Sequential Operations 20
C. The Virginia Ratification Declaration 22
D. The Incompatibility Clause as Explicit Prohibition 24
E. The Supremacy Clause Validity Test 25
F. Madison's 1806 Legal Opinion 26
G. Non-Delegation IS Separation of Powers 28
H. Madison's Warning: "Parchment Barriers" 29
I. Madison's Three-Part Test for Federal Authority 31
The Article I / Article V Distinction 32
Bond v. United States and the Unresolved Question 33
The Logical Proof 33
J. The "More Perfect Union": Self-Correction as Constitutional Design 34
PART III: THE SIX-STEP OBJECTIVE COMPLIANCE TEST 35
III. THE SIX-STEP OBJECTIVE COMPLIANCE TEST 35
A. Overview 35
B. Step One: Clause Identification 36
C. Step Two: Coordinate Action Classification 37
D. Step Three: Syllogism Construction 38
E. Step Four: Textual Consistency Analysis 40
F. Step Five: Structural Impossibility Determination 41
G. Step Six: Position Indivisibility Analysis 43
H. The Grammatical Foundation: Constitutional Text as English Construction 44
The Grammatical Impossibility of Subject Substitution 45

The Pronoun Proof 46
Constitutional Text Is Not a Policy Document 46
The Universal Principle 47
I. The Hierarchical Derivation Method 47
Illustrative Hierarchy: Federal Magistrate Judge 48
Application to Magistrate Judge Authority 49
The Test Operates at Every Tier 49
J. The Oath Distinction: Why Delegation Fails Independently 50
Two Constitutionally Distinct Oaths 50
Independent Constitutional Responsibility 51
The Lawful Source of Subordinate Authority 51
PART IV: THE SUBSTANTIVE COLLAPSE OF STANDING DOCTRINE 52
IV. THE SUBSTANTIVE COLLAPSE OF STANDING DOCTRINE 52
A. Process Challenges vs. Violation Claims 52
B. The Pre-1923 Doctrine 54
C. Fairchild v. Hughes: Correct but Narrow 55
D. Frothingham v. Mellon: The Improper Expansion 56
E. The Four Categories of Claims 58
PART V: THE PROCEDURAL COLLAPSE: THE 1938 MERGER 60
V. THE PROCEDURAL COLLAPSE: THE 1938 MERGER 60
A. Article III's Dual Jurisdictional Grant 60
B. The English Inheritance 60
C. The Distinction Between "Case" and "Suit" 62
D. The 1938 Merger 63
E. What the Merger Did Not Do 64
PART VI: THE UNIFIED FRAMEWORK 66
VI. THE UNIFIED FRAMEWORK 66
A. Why Lujan Is Correct for Statutory Claims 66
B. Why Equitable Standing Is Correct for Constitutional Violations 67
C. Bond v. United States: The Framework Confirmed 68
D. Bond's "Proper Case": Binary Violations and Concomitant Injury 69
Binary Textual Violations 70
When Standing Collapses Into the Merits 71
Concomitant Injury 72

The Three-Prong Test 73
The Floodgate Concern Forecloses Itself 73
E. Existing Doctrines That Already Recognize Binary Standing 74
Heckler v. Chaney's Distinction 74
Dunlop v. Bachowski's Limitation 75
The Mandamus Tradition 75
The Common Principle 75
F. The Two Sources of Law 76
PART VII: APPLICATIONS OF THE OBJECTIVE TEST 77
VII. APPLICATIONS OF THE OBJECTIVE TEST 77
A. Tariff Delegation 77
Recent Confirmation: Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump (2026) 79
B. Qualified Immunity 80
The Nine Specific Failures of Harlow v. Fitzgerald 82
C. Revenue Bill Origination 85
D. IEEPA Tariff Authority 86
E. Administrative Rulemaking 87
F. Impoundment 88
G. Prosecutorial Non-Prosecution Agreements 89
PART VIII: HISTORICAL VALIDATION 90
VIII. HISTORICAL VALIDATION 90
A. Methodology 90
B. Results 90
C. Implications 92
The Logical Bind 93
Burden Shift 93
Implications for Pending Applications 94
PART IX: THE CONSTITUTIONAL NECESSITY OF JUDICIAL ADOPTION 95
IX. THE CONSTITUTIONAL NECESSITY OF JUDICIAL ADOPTION 95
A. The War Powers Pattern 95
B. The Subjective Qualifier Defect 96
C. Congressional Abdication as Structural Pattern 97
D. The Framework Gap in Practice 98
PART X: CONCLUSION 100

X. CONCLUSION ... 100
AFTERWORD: THE HUMAN COST ... 101
BIBLIOGRAPHY ... 102
Constitutional Provisions ... 102
Supreme Court Cases ... 103
Lower Court Cases ... 105
Statutes ... 105
Founding Era Documents ... 105
Books and Treatises ... 106
News Sources ... 106

For 239 years, the United States has lacked any objective legal definition of what constitutes a "separation of powers violation." The *Youngstown* framework describes zones of presidential power but provides no violation test. Formalist approaches categorize powers without defining violations. Functionalist approaches employ balancing tests that are inherently subjective. The consequence is that separation of powers disputes are resolved by power rather than law—the party in power defines its own limits, and the Constitution becomes advisory.

This Article recovers what Madison actually wrote. Madison never used "separation" in the Federalist Papers; he used "distribution," which carries different legal implications for the transferability of power. "Balance" and "check" are not synonyms but sequential operations—structural equilibrium followed by negative checking upon attempted overreach. And non-delegation is not a separate doctrine but a definitional synonym for separation of powers itself: to "separate" means to keep apart; to "delegate" means to transfer together.

From Madison's framework, this Article derives a six-step objective compliance test that any court can apply without subjective policy judgments. The test asks: (1) Which clause assigns the power? (2) What type of action is claimed? (3) Does a valid syllogism connect the clause to the action? (4) Does the same interpretive method work for ALL parallel clauses? (5) Is the power structurally non-delegable? (6) Does the claimed actor satisfy ALL definitional clauses for the assigned position?

Madison's own three-part test from the Report of 1800 confirms this framework: a claimed federal power must be (1) expressly delegated, (2) necessary and proper to execute an express power, and (3) not expressly forbidden by amendment. Failing any prong renders the federal government "destitute of all such authority"—Madison's words, admitting no qualification. The Necessary and Proper Clause authorizes Congress to *implement* constitutional powers, not to *modify* them; structural modifications require Article V amendment. Read together with the Supremacy Clause's "in Pursuance thereof" validity test, the framework demands that all federal action trace through valid constitutional derivation or fail.

This Article validates the test against 36 Supreme Court decisions spanning 154 years (1872-2021). The test correctly identifies as unconstitutional every action the Court has invalidated—a 100% correspondence rate. The Supreme Court's 2026 decision in *Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump* confirmed this validation by holding that IEEPA does not delegate tariff authority to the executive—exactly the result the test produces. Applied to seven additional constitutional questions—tariff delegation, qualified immunity, revenue bill origination, IEEPA tariff authority, administrative rulemaking, impoundment, and prosecutorial non-prosecution agreements—the test yields unconstitutional in all seven. The validation creates a logical bind: critics must either accept the test's untested results or explain why the methodology works perfectly for thirty-six cases but fails for actions they prefer not to examine.

Finally, this Article recovers the standing doctrine necessary to enforce the test. The 1938 Federal Rules merger collapsed two distinct Article III jurisdictions—"Law" and "Equity"—without constitutional analysis. Before 1923, shared constitutional injuries were sufficient for equity jurisdiction. *Crampton v. Zabriskie* (1879), never overruled, held that injuries "in common with other property holders" supported taxpayer standing. The modern "particularized injury" requirement developed for *statutory* claims should not bar *constitutional* violation claims, where citizens enforce the People's direct expression of will. *Bond v. United States* (2011) confirmed that individuals may challenge structural constitutional violations; this Article specifies the criteria Kennedy's "proper case" qualifier requires—violations that are binary (textually determinable), self-evident (resolvable by reading the provision), and accompanied by concomitant injury (the cost of redress forced onto the citizen by the enforcement void). This three-prong test draws on existing doctrines (*Heckler v. Chaney*, *Dunlop v. Bachowski*, the mandamus tradition) that already recognize standing for binary legal questions, identifying the unifying principle that justifies citizen enforcement of clear constitutional text.

Madison warned that "a mere demarcation on parchment of the constitutional limits... is not a sufficient guard against those encroachments which lead to a tyrannical concentration of all the powers of government." For 239 years, his warning has been prophetic. This Article provides what Madison knew was necessary: an objective enforcement mechanism that makes the Constitution more than parchment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

• [I. Introduction](#i-introduction)

• [A. The 239-Year Gap](#a-the-239-year-gap)

• [B. The Life-and-Death Urgency](#b-the-life-and-death-urgency)

• [C. Thesis and Roadmap](#c-thesis-and-roadmap)

• [II. The Madisonian Framework](#ii-the-madisonian-framework)

• [A. "Distribution" Not "Separation"](#a-distribution-not-separation)

• [B. "Balance and Check" as Sequential Operations](#b-balance-and-check-as-sequential-operations)

• [C. The Virginia Ratification Declaration](#c-the-virginia-ratification-declaration)

• [D. The Incompatibility Clause as Explicit Prohibition](#d-the-incompatibility-clause-as-explicit-prohibition)

• [E. The Supremacy Clause Validity Test](#e-the-supremacy-clause-validity-test)

• [F. Madison's 1806 Legal Opinion](#f-madisons-1806-legal-opinion)

• [G. Non-Delegation IS Separation of Powers](#g-non-delegation-is-separation-of-powers)

• [H. Madison's Warning: "Parchment Barriers"](#h-madisons-warning-parchment-barriers)

• [I. Madison's Three-Part Test for Federal Authority](#i-madisons-three-part-test-for-federal-authority)

• [J. The "More Perfect Union": Self-Correction as Constitutional Design](#j-the-more-perfect-union-self-correction-as-constitutional-design)

• [III. The Six-Step Objective Compliance Test](#iii-the-six-step-objective-compliance-test)

• [A. Overview](#a-overview)

• [B. Step One: Clause Identification](#b-step-one-clause-identification)

• [C. Step Two: Coordinate Action Classification](#c-step-two-coordinate-action-classification)

• [D. Step Three: Syllogism Construction](#d-step-three-syllogism-construction)

• [E. Step Four: Textual Consistency Analysis](#e-step-four-textual-consistency-analysis)

• [F. Step Five: Structural Impossibility Determination](#f-step-five-structural-impossibility-determination)

• [G. Step Six: Position Indivisibility Analysis](#g-step-six-position-indivisibility-analysis)

• [H. The Grammatical Foundation: Constitutional Text as English Construction](#h-the-grammatical-foundation-constitutional-text-as-english-construction)

• [I. The Hierarchical Derivation Method](#i-the-hierarchical-derivation-method)

• [J. The Oath Distinction: Why Delegation Fails Independently](#j-the-oath-distinction-why-delegation-fails-independently)

• [IV. The Substantive Collapse of Standing Doctrine](#iv-the-substantive-collapse-of-standing-doctrine)

• [A. Process Challenges vs. Violation Claims](#a-process-challenges-vs-violation-claims)

• [B. The Pre-1923 Doctrine](#b-the-pre-1923-doctrine)

• [C. Fairchild v. Hughes: Correct but Narrow](#c-fairchild-v-hughes-correct-but-narrow)

• [D. Frothingham v. Mellon: The Improper Expansion](#d-frothingham-v-mellon-the-improper-expansion)

• [E. The Four Categories of Claims](#e-the-four-categories-of-claims)

• [V. The Procedural Collapse: The 1938 Merger](#v-the-procedural-collapse-the-1938-merger)

• [A. Article III's Dual Jurisdictional Grant](#a-article-iiis-dual-jurisdictional-grant)

• [B. The English Inheritance](#b-the-english-inheritance)

• [C. The Distinction Between "Case" and "Suit"](#c-the-distinction-between-case-and-suit)

• [D. The 1938 Merger](#d-the-1938-merger)

• [E. What the Merger Did Not Do](#e-what-the-merger-did-not-do)

• [VI. The Unified Framework](#vi-the-unified-framework)

• [A. Why Lujan Is Correct for Statutory Claims](#a-why-lujan-is-correct-for-statutory-claims)

• [B. Why Equitable Standing Is Correct for Constitutional Violations](#b-why-equitable-standing-is-correct-for-constitutional-violations)

• [C. Bond v. United States: The Framework Confirmed](#c-bond-v-united-states-the-framework-confirmed)

• [D. Bond's "Proper Case": Binary Violations and Concomitant Injury](#d-bonds-proper-case-binary-violations-and-concomitant-injury)

• [E. Existing Doctrines That Already Recognize Binary Standing](#e-existing-doctrines-that-already-recognize-binary-standing)

• [F. The Two Sources of Law](#f-the-two-sources-of-law)

• [VII. Applications of the Objective Test](#vii-applications-of-the-objective-test)

• [A. Tariff Delegation](#a-tariff-delegation)

• [B. Qualified Immunity](#b-qualified-immunity)

• [C. Revenue Bill Origination](#c-revenue-bill-origination)

• [D. IEEPA Tariff Authority](#d-ieepa-tariff-authority)

• [E. Administrative Rulemaking](#e-administrative-rulemaking)

• [F. Impoundment](#f-impoundment)

• [G. Prosecutorial Non-Prosecution Agreements](#g-prosecutorial-non-prosecution-agreements)

• [VIII. Historical Validation](#viii-historical-validation)

• [A. Methodology](#a-methodology)

• [B. Results](#b-results)

• [C. Implications](#c-implications)

• [IX. The Constitutional Necessity of Judicial Adoption](#ix-the-constitutional-necessity-of-judicial-adoption)

• [A. The War Powers Pattern](#a-the-war-powers-pattern)

• [B. The Subjective Qualifier Defect](#b-the-subjective-qualifier-defect)

• [C. Congressional Abdication as Structural Pattern](#c-congressional-abdication-as-structural-pattern)

• [D. The Framework Gap in Practice](#d-the-framework-gap-in-practice)

• [X. Conclusion](#x-conclusion)

PART I: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The 239-Year Gap

No objective legal definition of "separation of powers violation" exists in American jurisprudence. This is not hyperbole—it is a precise description of the current state of constitutional law. The phrase "separation of powers" appears nowhere in the Constitution's text.[1] The Supreme Court has never articulated a definition that permits objective determination of when a violation has occurred. And for 239 years, from the Constitution's ratification to the present day, this definitional void has permitted separation of powers disputes to be resolved by power rather than law.

1 The Constitution employs structural separation through its vesting clauses—"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress," U.S. Const. art. I, § 1; "The executive Power shall be vested in a President," U.S. Const. art. II, § 1; "The judicial Power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court," U.S. Const. art. III, § 1—but the phrase "separation of powers" is a scholarly construct, not constitutional text.

The *Youngstown* framework, the dominant analytical structure for separation of powers questions, illustrates the problem.[2] Justice Jackson's famous concurrence describes three zones of presidential power: (1) when the President acts pursuant to congressional authorization, executive authority is at its maximum; (2) when the President acts in the absence of congressional grant or denial, there is a "zone of twilight" where authority is uncertain; and (3) when the President acts contrary to congressional will, executive power is at its "lowest ebb."[3] This framework describes the relative strength of presidential claims across different circumstances. What it does not do—what no framework in American law does—is define what constitutes a *violation*.

Consider the logical structure. *Youngstown* tells us that when the President acts contrary to congressional will, executive authority is weakest. But "weakest" is not "absent." The framework provides no test for determining when executive action in "Zone Three" crosses from constitutionally weak to constitutionally prohibited. The party asserting violation must prove... what, exactly? That the action exceeds some undefined threshold of impermissibility? That it transgresses some unspecified boundary? The framework provides no answer.

Formalist approaches to separation of powers fare no better. Formalism categorizes governmental powers into legislative, executive, and judicial functions, then asks whether the challenged action fits the proper category.[4] This approach at least attempts categorical definition, but it collapses upon examination. When Congress delegates rulemaking authority to an executive agency, is the resulting rule "legislative" (because it has the force of law) or "executive" (because an executive agency promulgated it)? Formalism provides no answer beyond the analyst's intuition about which category feels right.

---

2 Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579 (1952).
3 *Id.* at 635-38 (Jackson, J., concurring).
4 *See, e.g.*, INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 919 (1983) (applying formalist analysis to legislative veto).

Functionalist approaches explicitly embrace this indeterminacy. Functionalism asks whether the challenged arrangement unduly aggrandizes one branch at the expense of another, or unduly undermines a branch's ability to perform its constitutional functions.[5] But "unduly" is inherently subjective. How much aggrandizement is "due"? How much undermining is tolerable? Functionalism converts separation of powers analysis into a balancing test where the weights are never specified, permitting courts to reach whatever result seems appropriate under the circumstances.

The political question doctrine compounds the problem. Under *Baker v. Carr*, courts decline to adjudicate questions that are "textually committed" to coordinate branches or that lack "judicially discoverable and manageable standards."[6] But what is a "judicially discoverable" standard for separation of powers? The doctrine assumes such standards exist while simultaneously excusing courts from articulating them. When separation of powers questions are dismissed as "political questions" for lack of manageable standards, the dismissal confirms that no one has developed the standards—while ensuring no one ever will.

The consequence of this definitional void is that the Constitution's structural safeguards operate as suggestions rather than commands. The party in power defines its own limits. Constitutional boundaries exist on paper but evaporate upon challenge. And Madison's primary structural safeguard against tyranny—the separation of powers—becomes what he warned against: "parchment barriers" insufficient to guard against "encroachments which lead to a tyrannical concentration of all the powers of government in the same hands."[7]

---

5 *See* Nixon v. Adm'r of Gen. Servs., 433 U.S. 425, 443 (1977) (applying functional balancing).
6 Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186, 217 (1962).
7 The Federalist No. 48, at 308 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961).

B. The Life-and-Death Urgency

This is not an academic problem. The absence of an objective test for separation of powers violations produces consequences measured in lives and dollars.

Consider tariff delegation. Article I, Section 8 assigns to Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises."[8] Yet since the Trade Act of 1974, Presidents have claimed statutory authority to impose tariffs unilaterally.[9] When the President imposes tariffs, billions of dollars are extracted from American consumers and businesses. When those extractions are challenged, litigation proceeds for years while the unconstitutional harm accumulates. Successful challenges reach only the statutory question—whether the President properly invoked the delegating statute—not the constitutional question of whether Congress could delegate the power at all. The President loses one statutory argument and invokes another statute. The constitutional violation continues through "statutory whack-a-mole" while the People bear the cost.

Consider qualified immunity. The doctrine shields government officials from civil liability for constitutional violations unless the violated right was "clearly established."[10] This is a judicially-created doctrine—Section 1983 provides that "every person" who deprives constitutional rights "shall be liable," with no immunity exception in the text.[11] Yet courts have manufactured an exception that now controls more than the statutory text itself. The result is documented: unarmed citizens killed by law enforcement officers who face no civil accountability because no prior case involved sufficiently identical facts. The constitutional

8 U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 1.
9 Trade Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-618, § 122, 88 Stat. 1978 (codified at 19 U.S.C. § 2132).
10 Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982).
11 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

violation occurs; the remedy is foreclosed; and the "clearly established" requirement ensures the right is never established because cases are dismissed before creating precedent.

Consider war powers. Article I, Section 8 assigns to Congress the power to "declare War."[12] The President's authority as Commander in Chief extends to commanding authorized military operations and repelling sudden attacks when congressional deliberation is impossible.[13] Yet Presidents routinely initiate sustained military operations without congressional authorization, claiming statutory authorizations or inherent executive power. When such operations are challenged, courts invoke the political question doctrine and decline to adjudicate. The constitutional violation proceeds; the checking mechanism fails; and American service members die in conflicts the Constitution assigned Congress to authorize.

The common thread is the absence of an objective test. If courts cannot determine when a separation of powers violation has occurred, they cannot provide remedy. If remedy is unavailable, the constitutional structure provides no constraint. If the structure provides no constraint, the party in power defines its own limits—which is to say, no limits exist at all.

C. Thesis and Roadmap

This Article provides what 239 years of constitutional practice has failed to establish: an objective test for identifying separation of powers violations. The test is not novel doctrine but recovered architecture—derived from what James Madison actually wrote, validated against what the Supreme Court has actually decided, and applicable without the subjective policy judgments that render current frameworks indeterminate.

---

12 U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 11.

13 *See* James Madison, Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787, at 476 (Aug. 17, 1787) (recording the change from "make" to "declare" war to preserve presidential power to "repel sudden attacks").

Part II recovers Madison's constitutional framework. Madison never used "separation" in the Federalist Papers; he used "distribution." "Balance" and "check" are not synonyms but sequential operations. The Virginia Ratification Declaration establishes binding terms of the constitutional compact. The Incompatibility Clause provides explicit textual prohibition of power accumulation. And non-delegation is not a discretionary judicial policy but a definitional synonym for separation of powers itself.

Part III presents the six-step objective compliance test derived from Madison's framework. A coordinate government action passes the test only if it: (1) derives from an identified constitutional clause; (2) is properly classified by action type; (3) can be connected to the clause through valid syllogism; (4) employs an interpretive method that works for all parallel clauses; (5) does not involve structurally non-delegable power; and (6) is exercised by an actor who satisfies all definitional clauses for the assigned position. Failure at any step establishes constitutional invalidity.

Parts IV and V recover the standing doctrine necessary to enforce the test. Part IV addresses the substantive collapse—the improper extension of *Fairchild* and *Frothingham* from process challenges (correctly barred) to violation claims (incorrectly barred). Part V addresses the procedural collapse—the 1938 Federal Rules merger that collapsed Article III's distinct "Law" and "Equity" jurisdictions without constitutional analysis. Together, these Parts establish that citizen standing for enumerated constitutional violations is not novel doctrine but recovered constitutional architecture.

Part VI presents the unified framework. *Lujan*'s particularized injury requirement is correct for statutory claims, where the People's will is expressed through legislative process, and petitioners cannot claim to speak for all Americans without overriding that process. But for enumerated constitutional violations, citizens *can* speak for all Americans because the Constitution *is* the People's direct expression of will. The framework completes *Lujan* rather than contradicting it.

Part VII applies the objective test to seven contemporary constitutional questions: tariff delegation, qualified immunity, executive bill origination, IEEPA tariff authority, administrative rulemaking, impoundment, and prosecutorial non-prosecution agreements. All seven fail the test, establishing their constitutional invalidity through objective textual analysis rather than judicial policy preference.

Part VIII validates the test against 36 Supreme Court decisions spanning 154 years (1872-2021). The test produces "UNCONSTITUTIONAL" for every action the Court has invalidated—a 100% correspondence rate that validates the methodology as consistent with established constitutional jurisprudence.

Part IX establishes the constitutional necessity of judicial adoption. The framework gap is not academic but urgent. Congressional capture, documented through the *Interstate Circuit* doctrine, prevents the political branches from checking constitutional violations. The judiciary is the last remaining institutional safeguard. Without an objective test, that safeguard cannot function.

Part X concludes. Madison's framework has existed for 236 years. What has been missing is judicial recognition that such a framework exists and must be applied. The test does not require courts to make policy judgments—it requires them to perform textual analysis. The Constitution can be more than parchment if courts will enforce what Madison wrote.

PART II: THE MADISONIAN FRAMEWORK

II. THE MADISONIAN FRAMEWORK

A. "Distribution" Not "Separation"

A search of Madison's contributions to the Federalist Papers reveals a striking terminological pattern: Madison never used the word "separation" to describe the constitutional structure. He used "distribution."[14]

This is not semantic triviality. The words carry different legal implications. "Separation" implies division—the creation of boundaries between things that might otherwise intermingle. "Distribution" implies assignment—the allocation of specific items to specific recipients. When property is "distributed" through a will, the executor does not merely "separate" the estate from the outside world; the executor assigns particular assets to particular beneficiaries according to the testator's instructions.

Madison understood the Constitution as a distribution instrument. The People, as the ultimate source of governmental authority, distributed specific powers to specific governmental positions. Article I distributes legislative powers to Congress. Article II distributes executive power to the President. Article III distributes judicial power to the federal courts. The remaining powers, under the Tenth Amendment, are "reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."[15]

The implications for delegation analysis are significant. If powers are merely "separated," they might be recombined under appropriate circumstances—the boundaries are permeable if the branches consent. But if powers are "distributed" to specific positions, recombination requires

---

14 *See* The Federalist No. 47, at 301-02 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961) (using "distribution" repeatedly while never using "separation").

15 U.S. Const. amend. X.

redistribution—a transfer of what was assigned to one position to a different position. And redistribution of constitutional assignments requires constitutional amendment under Article V, not statutory enactment under Article I.

Madison's terminology in Federalist No. 47 is precise. He addresses the "political maxim that the legislative, executive, and judiciary departments ought to be separate and distinct."[16] But note that Madison does not endorse this maxim in its absolute form. He quotes Montesquieu extensively to demonstrate that the maxim, properly understood, does not require complete isolation of powers but rather prohibits the "whole power" of one department being exercised by those who possess the "whole power" of another.[17]

The constitutional structure that emerges is not three hermetically sealed departments but three positions to which specific powers are distributed. The positions may interact—indeed, the Constitution requires interaction through mechanisms like the presidential veto and Senate confirmation. But the underlying distribution remains fixed. Powers assigned to Congress remain assigned to Congress regardless of what statutes Congress enacts. Powers assigned to the President remain assigned to the President regardless of congressional attempts to reassign them. The distribution is constitutional architecture, not statutory preference.

B. "Balance and Check" as Sequential Operations

Modern constitutional discourse treats "checks and balances" as a unitary phrase describing a single constitutional mechanism. Madison's writings reveal that "balance" and "check" are distinct operations that function sequentially.

---

16 The Federalist No. 47, at 301 (James Madison).

17 *Id.* at 302-03 ("When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or body... there can be no liberty.... Were the power of judging joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control....").

"Balance" describes the initial structural equilibrium. The Constitution distributes powers among three branches such that no single branch possesses the "whole power" of government. This distribution creates structural balance—each branch has sufficient power to perform its constitutional functions, but no branch has sufficient power to dominate the others. Balance is achieved through the initial distribution and maintained through the ongoing operation of that distribution.

"Check" describes what happens when a branch attempts to exceed its distributed powers. The checking mechanism is negative—it operates to block overreach, not to authorize action. When the President vetoes legislation, he exercises a check on congressional power. When Congress overrides a veto, it exercises a check on presidential power. When the judiciary declares legislation unconstitutional, it exercises a check on both. These are reactive operations triggered by attempted overreach, not proactive grants of authority.

Madison explains this sequential operation in Federalist No. 51:

> But the great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others.... Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.[18]

The key phrase is "resist encroachments." Checking is defensive—it presupposes that another branch has attempted to exceed its distributed powers. The checking mechanism activates only when balance is threatened. If no encroachment occurs, no check is necessary.

This sequential understanding has implications for judicial review. When a court reviews a separation of powers challenge, it asks two questions: (1) Has the initial distribution been respected? (2) If not, have the checking mechanisms operated to restore balance? If the

18 The Federalist No. 51, at 322 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961).

distribution has been violated and the checks have failed—as when Congress delegates power without meaningful constraint and the executive exercises that delegated power without judicial correction—the constitutional structure has collapsed. Both balance and check have failed.

The current doctrine conflates these operations, treating "checks and balances" as a general description of inter-branch interaction. This conflation obscures the constitutional violation. When courts describe congressional delegation to the executive as part of the normal "checks and balances" system, they treat as constitutional architecture what is actually constitutional collapse. The balance has been destroyed (power accumulated in one branch), and the check has failed (no mechanism has blocked the accumulation). Describing this as "checks and balances" functioning normally inverts the constitutional design.

C. The Virginia Ratification Declaration

Virginia's ratification of the Constitution was not unconditional. The Virginia Convention adopted a formal declaration setting forth the terms under which ratification was granted. These terms are not precatory suggestions; they are binding conditions of Virginia's accession to the constitutional compact.

The Virginia Ratification Declaration of June 26, 1788, provides in relevant part:

> We the Delegates of the People of Virginia... DO in the name and in behalf of the People of Virginia declare and make known that the powers granted under the Constitution being derived from the People of the United States may be resumed by them whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression and that every power not granted thereby remains with them and at their will.[19]

The Declaration establishes several propositions that bear directly on separation of powers analysis.

---

19 Virginia Ratification Declaration (June 26, 1788), *reprinted in* 3 Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution 656 (Jonathan Elliot ed., 2d ed. 1891).

First, powers are "granted"—distributed to specific positions for specific purposes. The federal government does not possess inherent authority; it possesses only what the People granted through ratification. This confirms the distributional understanding of constitutional structure.

Second, powers "may be resumed... whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression." Virginia did not surrender its authority absolutely; it delegated authority conditionally, retaining the right to resume powers that are perverted from their intended purposes. This is not a claim of unilateral secession but a statement about the nature of the constitutional grant.

Third, "every power not granted thereby remains with them and at their will." This anticipates the Tenth Amendment and confirms that the Constitution operates through enumeration, not general grant. Powers not distributed remain with the People.

Madison's connection to this Declaration is direct. As a Virginia delegate, he was intimately familiar with its terms. As the primary drafter of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, he understood these terms as the foundation upon which the constitutional structure rested. Virginia's conditional ratification—like similar declarations from other states—establishes that the Constitution is not a blank check but a limited grant.

For separation of powers analysis, the Virginia Declaration establishes that exercises of federal power must trace to constitutional grant. When the executive exercises tariff authority, the question is not whether Congress delegated such authority but whether the Constitution granted Congress the power to delegate it. If tariff authority is distributed to Congress by Article I, Section 8, then Congress cannot redistribute it to the President through ordinary legislation.

Such redistribution would "pervert" the constitutional distribution to purposes other than those for which it was granted.

D. The Incompatibility Clause as Explicit Prohibition

The Constitution's structural separation is implicit in its vesting clauses—Article I vests legislative power in Congress, Article II vests executive power in the President, Article III vests judicial power in the courts. But one provision makes the prohibition on power accumulation explicit: the Incompatibility Clause.

Article I, Section 6, Clause 2 provides:

> No Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.[20]

This is the Constitution's only explicit reference to the accumulation of powers in the same hands. A person holding executive office cannot simultaneously serve in Congress. A person serving in Congress cannot simultaneously hold executive office. Personal accumulation of legislative and executive power is expressly forbidden.

The clause operates as a textual anchor for the broader principle. If personal accumulation is prohibited—if a single individual cannot simultaneously exercise legislative and executive power—then institutional accumulation is prohibited a fortiori. The greater prohibition implies the lesser. If one person cannot be both legislator and executive, then one branch cannot simultaneously exercise both legislative and executive functions.

Consider the converse. If institutional accumulation were permitted—if Congress could transfer legislative power to the executive branch through ordinary statute—then the

20 U.S. Const. art. I, § 6, cl. 2.

Incompatibility Clause would be trivially evaded. A Member of Congress who wished to exercise executive power could simply vote to delegate that power to the President, then resign from Congress and accept a presidential appointment. The personal prohibition would be satisfied (no simultaneous holding of offices), but the substantive prohibition (no accumulation of legislative and executive power) would be defeated.

The Incompatibility Clause thus confirms what the vesting clauses imply: powers distributed to specific positions must remain with those positions. Redistribution through personal accumulation is prohibited; redistribution through institutional accumulation is equally prohibited. The explicit textual prohibition on the lesser form confirms the implicit structural prohibition on the greater form.

E. The Supremacy Clause Validity Test

Article VI establishes the Constitution and laws "made in Pursuance thereof" as "the supreme Law of the Land."[21] The qualifying phrase—"made in Pursuance thereof"—is not surplusage. It establishes a validity condition: not all laws enacted by Congress qualify as supreme law. Only laws "made in Pursuance" of the Constitution possess that status.

This is the test courts need for separation of powers analysis. The question is not merely whether Congress enacted a statute or the President issued an order. The question is whether the statute or order was "made in Pursuance" of constitutional structure. An act that violates the constitutional distribution of powers is not "made in Pursuance" and therefore is not supreme law—it is no law at all.

Chief Justice Marshall recognized this principle in *Marbury v. Madison*:

21 U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2.

> Certainly all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the nation, and consequently the theory of every such government must be, that an act of the legislature, repugnant to the constitution, is void.[22]

An act "repugnant to the constitution" is void. This includes acts that violate the constitutional distribution of powers. When Congress enacts a statute delegating legislative power to the executive—when the statute purports to transfer what the Constitution distributed—that statute is "repugnant to the constitution" and is void. It does not become constitutional merely because Congress enacted it. It does not become supreme law merely because it bears the formal characteristics of legislation. The Supremacy Clause conditions supremacy on constitutional validity.

The phrase "in Pursuance thereof" thus provides the constitutional test for separation of powers compliance. Does the challenged action pursue—carry into execution—the constitutional distribution? Or does it violate that distribution by reassigning powers to positions other than those to which the Constitution assigned them? If the former, the action is valid. If the latter, it is void.

F. Madison's 1806 Legal Opinion

Madison's theoretical framework is confirmed by his practical application when constitutional questions arose during his service as Secretary of State. The Burr Conspiracy of 1806 presented precisely such a question.

Former Vice President Aaron Burr had assembled an armed force in the western territories for purposes that remain historically debated—possibly to invade Spanish Mexico, possibly to detach western states from the Union, possibly both. President Jefferson faced a

22 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803).

genuine emergency: an armed conspiracy led by a former high official, operating beyond the effective reach of federal law enforcement, potentially threatening both foreign relations and domestic unity.

The question was whether the President possessed inherent emergency power to deploy regular federal troops without congressional authorization. The existing statutes authorized only the use of militia, not regular army forces. Could the President, facing genuine armed conspiracy, exercise implied emergency power to deploy troops despite the absence of statutory authorization?

Madison's legal opinion answered: no.[23]

Madison examined the constitutional text, found no authorization for presidential deployment of regular troops, and concluded that the power did not exist—even in genuine emergency. The President could act within the existing statutory framework (militia deployment), but he could not assume powers the Constitution did not grant merely because circumstances seemed to require them.

This opinion devastates the claim that emergency justifies constitutional deviation. Madison—the primary architect of the Constitution, writing in the face of actual armed conspiracy—refused to find implied emergency powers. If emergency could justify unauthorized action, the Burr Conspiracy was surely emergency enough. Yet Madison concluded that constitutional limits applied even there.

Only after Congress enacted the Insurrection Act of 1807 did presidential authority to deploy regular troops exist.[24] The statute provided what the Constitution did not—congressional authorization for executive action. This is the constitutional process working as designed:

---

23 *See* James Madison to Albert Gallatin (Aug. 1806), *in* 7 The Writings of James Madison 155-56 (Gaillard Hunt ed., 1908).

24 Insurrection Act of 1807, ch. 39, 2 Stat. 443.

Congress identifies the need for executive authority, Congress grants that authority through legislation, and the executive then possesses statutory authorization that it previously lacked.

The implication for modern separation of powers analysis is direct. If Madison refused to find implied emergency power facing genuine armed conspiracy, claims of implied power in lesser circumstances are substantially weaker. Emergency does not create constitutional authority. It reveals the necessity of obtaining proper authorization through constitutional processes.

G. Non-Delegation IS Separation of Powers

The non-delegation doctrine and the separation of powers principle are treated in modern jurisprudence as distinct doctrines with different analytical frameworks. This treatment obscures their definitional identity.

Consider the terms. To "separate" means to keep apart, to divide, to place in distinct categories. To "delegate" means to transfer, to authorize another to act in one's place, to convey power from one holder to another. These are antonyms. Separation requires keeping powers apart; delegation requires bringing them together. You cannot have separation while having delegation. The concepts are mutually exclusive by definition.

When Congress "delegates" legislative power to the executive branch, what has happened to the "separation" of powers? The legislative power has moved from its constitutionally assigned position (Congress) to a different position (the Executive). The separation has been collapsed. The powers are no longer apart; they are together. Whatever this arrangement may be called, it is not "separation of powers"—it is the opposite of separation of powers.

This definitional identity explains why the non-delegation doctrine has proven so difficult to enforce. Courts treating non-delegation as a discretionary policy choice—applicable when delegation goes "too far" but permissible within undefined limits—have severed the doctrine from its structural foundation. But if non-delegation and separation of powers are definitional synonyms, then any delegation destroys separation. There is no "acceptable" level of delegation any more than there is "acceptable" level of accumulation when Madison warned that accumulation is "the very definition of tyranny."[25]

The equation is complete: **Separation of Powers = Non-Delegation = Liberty**. Madison established that separation prevents tyranny. Delegation destroys separation. Therefore, delegation enables tyranny. The non-delegation doctrine is not an optional add-on to separation of powers analysis; it is separation of powers analysis under a different name.

H. Madison's Warning: "Parchment Barriers"

Madison's most prescient warning appears in Federalist No. 48:

> Will it be sufficient to mark, with precision, the boundaries of these departments, in the constitution of the government, and to trust to these parchment barriers against the encroaching spirit of power?[26]

Madison's answer was no. Mere textual boundaries would not suffice. The "encroaching spirit of power" would find ways to overcome written limitations unless structural mechanisms enforced those limitations. Hence the system of checks and balances—institutional arrangements that gave each branch "the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others."[27]

25 The Federalist No. 47, at 301 (James Madison).
26 The Federalist No. 48, at 308 (James Madison).
27 The Federalist No. 51, at 322 (James Madison).

But Madison's warning assumed that the checking mechanisms would function. What happens when they do not? What happens when Congress, instead of checking executive encroachment, enables it through delegation? What happens when the executive, instead of checking legislative overreach, embraces delegated legislative power? What happens when the judiciary, instead of enforcing constitutional boundaries, defers to coordinate branch assertions of authority?

The answer is that parchment barriers fail. The constitutional text establishes boundaries, but without enforcement, those boundaries become advisory. The party in power defines its own limits. Madison's warning becomes reality: "a mere demarcation on parchment of the constitutional limits of the several departments, is not a sufficient guard against those encroachments which lead to a tyrannical concentration of all the powers of government in the same hands."[28]

For 239 years, this has been the American experience. The constitutional text remains unchanged, but constitutional practice has progressively concentrated power through delegation, deference, and doctrinal accommodation. The separation of powers has been praised in principle while abandoned in practice. And the reason is precisely what Madison identified: parchment barriers, without enforcement mechanisms, cannot constrain the encroaching spirit of power.

This Article provides what Madison knew was necessary: a mechanism for identifying when the parchment barriers have been breached. The six-step objective compliance test is not judicial policy-making but textual analysis. Courts applying the test do not balance competing interests or weigh policy considerations. They determine whether challenged actions can be derived through constitutional text or whether the derivation fails. When derivation fails, the

28 The Federalist No. 48, at 308 (James Madison).

action is unconstitutional—not because judges prefer a different policy, but because the Constitution does not authorize what the government has done.

I. Madison's Three-Part Test for Federal Authority

Madison's framework yields a structural enforcement mechanism. But Madison also articulated, in his own words, the definitive test for determining whether the federal government possesses any claimed power. In the Report of 1800, Madison wrote:

> The Constitution alone can answer this question. If no such power be expressly delegated, and if it be not both necessary and proper to carry into execution an express power—above all, if it be expressly forbidden, by a declaratory amendment to the Constitution—the answer must be, that the Federal Government is destitute of all such authority.[29]

The test is cumulative and dispositive. A claimed federal power must satisfy three requirements:

Step	**Question**	**If Answer Is "No"**
1	Is the power expressly delegated?	Federal government lacks authority
2	Is it both necessary and proper to carry into execution an express power?	Federal government lacks authority
3	Is it free from express prohibition by declaratory amendment?	Federal government is "destitute of all such authority"

If a claimed power fails any prong, "the Federal Government is destitute of all such authority." There is no residual implied power, no inherent authority, no emergency exception. Madison's language—"destitute of all such authority"—admits no qualification. A claimed power either survives all three prongs or it does not exist.

29 James Madison, Report of 1800 (Jan. 7, 1800), *reprinted in* 4 Elliot's Debates 546 (2d ed. 1891).

The Article I / Article V Distinction

Madison's test forecloses a common argument advanced to justify delegation: that Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 grants Congress plenary authority to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers." This argument conflates two distinct constitutional mechanisms:

Mechanism	**Function**	**Scope**
Article I Legislation	Implement powers already vested by the Constitution	Laws "in Pursuance" of existing constitutional grants
Article V Amendment	Modify the constitutional structure itself	Changes to enumerated powers, structural limits, or rights

The Necessary and Proper Clause authorizes Congress to *implement* constitutional powers—not to *circumvent* constitutional limits. A law that contravenes the Supremacy Clause—one that is NOT "in Pursuance" of the Constitution—cannot be enacted under Article I regardless of how "necessary" Congress deems it. Such structural modifications require Article V amendment.

This distinction is textually explicit. The Necessary and Proper Clause authorizes laws "for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution."[30] The clause presupposes the existence of constitutionally vested powers and authorizes their execution—not their expansion, transfer, or elimination. Congress cannot use the Necessary and Proper Clause to vest powers the Constitution did not vest, transfer powers the Constitution assigned elsewhere, or eliminate structural limits the Constitution imposed.

30 U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 18.

Bond v. United States and the Unresolved Question

In *Bond v. United States*, the Supreme Court recognized individual standing to challenge federal action exceeding constitutional limits but expressly declined to reach the merits of the Necessary and Proper Clause question:

> We do not address... the Government's argument that Congress may regulate the defendant's conduct under the Necessary and Proper Clause.[31]

The Court's reservation leaves open the precise question Madison's framework addresses: whether the Necessary and Proper Clause authorizes Congress to legislate structural changes that would otherwise require Article V amendment. Madison's framework answers definitively: it does not. Laws that redistribute constitutionally assigned powers, that accumulate what the Constitution distributed, or that eliminate structural safeguards the Framers embedded—these are not "necessary and proper" implementations of existing powers. They are structural modifications requiring Article V ratification by the States.

The Logical Proof

If Congress could use Article I to accomplish what Article V requires, Article V would be surplusage—the Framers would have written an amendment procedure that Congress could circumvent through ordinary legislation. But the Constitution contains no surplusage. Article V exists because some changes cannot be accomplished through Article I. The question is only which changes require which mechanism. The answer is structural: Article I implements; Article V modifies. Delegation of assigned enumerated powers is modification, not implementation.

---

31 Bond v. United States, 564 U.S. 211, 226 n.9 (2011).

J. The "More Perfect Union": Self-Correction as Constitutional Design

A standard objection to the framework this Article develops is that long-standing constitutional practice supplies its own validation: if delegation, qualified immunity, and similar arrangements have persisted for decades or centuries, surely they cannot be unconstitutional. This objection inverts the Constitution's own self-understanding.

The Preamble begins not with a claim of perfection but with an acknowledgment of imperfection and the aspiration to correct it:

> We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union...[32]

The comparative "more perfect" is deliberately chosen. The Founders did not claim to establish a perfect union—they sought a *more* perfect one than existed under the Articles of Confederation. This language acknowledges that the constitutional project is ongoing, that mistakes would be made, and that correction would be necessary.

The Preamble's purpose clause extends this obligation across generations: "...and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity..." "Posterity" imposes a forward-looking duty. The constitutional settlement is not merely for those who ratified it but for all future generations. This creates an affirmative obligation to identify and correct constitutional errors that have accumulated over time—even errors that have become normalized through repetition and judicial acquiescence.

Unconstitutional practices do not become constitutional through longevity. A violation repeated for decades remains a violation. The Preamble's aspiration toward "a more perfect Union" anticipates precisely this circumstance: that deviations from constitutional structure would occur, become entrenched, and require correction for the sake of posterity.

32 U.S. Const. pmbl.

Madison made this duty explicit in the *Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments*:

> It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties.... The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents.[33]

The objection that the Compliance Test would disturb settled practices inverts the constitutional order. Settled unconstitutional practices are precisely what "a more perfect Union" requires us to unsettle—not for the sake of disruption, but for the sake of posterity's liberty. The Test is not an attack on established governance; it is the fulfillment of the Preamble's design.

PART III: THE SIX-STEP OBJECTIVE COMPLIANCE TEST

III. THE SIX-STEP OBJECTIVE COMPLIANCE TEST

A. Overview

The Madisonian framework yields a six-step objective compliance test. A coordinate government action—whether legislative enactment, judicial doctrine, or executive enforcement—passes the test only if it passes all six steps. Failure at any step establishes constitutional invalidity.

Step	**Name**	**Core Question**
1	Clause Identification	Which constitutional clause assigns the power?
2	Coordinate Action Classification	Is it legislative enactment, judicial doctrine, or executive enforcement?

33 James Madison, *Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments* (1785), *in* 2 The Writings of James Madison 184 (Gaillard Hunt ed., 1901).

3	Syllogism Construction	Can we establish Major (clause) → Minor (in pursuance) → Conclusion (valid derivation)?
4	Textual Consistency	Does the same interpretive method yield valid results for ALL parallel clauses?
5	Structural Impossibility	Is the power inherently non-delegable?
6	Position Indivisibility	Does the claimed actor satisfy ALL definitional clauses for the assigned position?

The test is objective in the precise sense that its application does not depend on the analyst's policy preferences. Two analysts who disagree about whether tariff delegation is good policy should nonetheless agree about whether tariff delegation passes the test. The test asks structural questions with determinate answers: Does a constitutional clause assign the power? Can a valid syllogism be constructed? Does the interpretive method work for parallel clauses? These questions admit of yes-or-no answers that do not vary with political viewpoint.

B. Step One: Clause Identification

The first step identifies which constitutional clause assigns the power at issue. This establishes the Major Premise for syllogistic analysis.

Constitutional powers are assigned through specific textual provisions. Article I, Section 8 enumerates congressional powers—the power to tax, to borrow, to regulate commerce, to coin money, to establish post offices, to declare war, and so forth. Article II assigns executive power to the President and specifies particular executive functions—commander in chief, treaty-making (with Senate consent), appointment (with Senate consent), and the duty to "take Care that the

Laws be faithfully executed." Article III vests judicial power in federal courts and specifies the cases and controversies to which that power extends.

When a governmental action is challenged, the first question is: which clause authorizes this action? If the challenged action is tariff imposition by the President, the relevant clause is Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which assigns the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" to Congress. If the challenged action is a judicial doctrine limiting statutory remedies, the relevant clauses are those that assign the underlying power—for qualified immunity, the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, which assigns enforcement power to Congress.

Step One establishes the constitutional baseline. Before asking whether a challenged action is valid, we must identify what the Constitution actually provides. This sounds elementary, but separation of powers analysis frequently proceeds without clear identification of the relevant constitutional text.

C. Step Two: Coordinate Action Classification

The second step classifies the challenged action by type: legislative enactment, judicial doctrine, or executive enforcement. This classification determines which constitutional pathway applies.

Legislative enactments are acts of Congress—statutes enacted through bicameral passage and presentment to the President. Legislative enactments must be "made in Pursuance" of the Constitution to qualify as supreme law under Article VI. When Congress enacts a statute delegating authority to the executive, that statute is a legislative enactment whose validity depends on whether Congress possessed the power to delegate.

Judicial doctrines are rules created by courts through the adjudication of cases and controversies. Judicial doctrines must derive from Article III's grant of "judicial Power"—the power to decide cases, not to make law. When courts create immunity doctrines that limit statutory remedies, they create judicial doctrine whose validity depends on whether Article III authorizes such creation.

Executive enforcement comprises presidential and agency actions implementing (or claiming to implement) constitutional or statutory authority. Executive enforcement must derive from a valid constitutional grant or a valid statutory delegation. When the President imposes tariffs, he engages in executive enforcement whose validity depends on whether he possesses constitutional or statutory authority to impose tariffs.

The classification determines the analytical pathway. Legislative enactments are tested against Article I's enumeration of congressional powers. Judicial doctrines are tested against Article III's limitation to cases and controversies. Executive enforcement is tested against Article II's vesting of executive power and the validity of any claimed statutory authorization.

D. Step Three: Syllogism Construction

The third step attempts to construct a valid syllogism connecting the constitutional clause to the challenged action.

A syllogism is a logical argument consisting of a Major Premise, a Minor Premise, and a Conclusion. In constitutional analysis:

- **Major Premise**: The constitutional clause assigns power X to position Y.
- **Minor Premise**: The challenged action is an exercise of power X "in Pursuance" of the constitutional assignment.
- **Conclusion**: Therefore, the challenged action is constitutionally valid.

The syllogism is valid only if the Minor Premise is true—if the challenged action actually is "in Pursuance" of the constitutional assignment. This is where most separation of powers violations occur: the Minor Premise claims derivation from constitutional authority, but the claim fails upon examination.

Consider tariff delegation. The claimed syllogism is:

Step	**Premise**
MAJOR	"The Congress shall have Power To lay... Duties" (Art. I, § 8, cl. 1)
MINOR	Section 122 of the Trade Act is law "in Pursuance thereof" delegating this power to the President
CONCLUSION	Therefore, the President may impose tariffs as delegate of congressional power

The Major Premise is accurate—Article I, Section 8 does assign the Duties power to Congress. The question is whether the Minor Premise is valid: Can Congress delegate what the Constitution assigned to Congress? Is a delegation statute "in Pursuance" of the constitutional assignment, or does it contradict that assignment by transferring power away from the assigned position?

Step Three identifies the logical structure of the constitutional claim. If the syllogism cannot be constructed—if no plausible Minor Premise connects the clause to the action—the action fails at this step. If the syllogism can be constructed, it must survive the remaining steps to establish validity.

E. Step Four: Textual Consistency Analysis

The fourth step applies Madison's principle of textual consistency: "the same argument results from the same consideration."[34] If an interpretive method validates the challenged action, that same method must yield valid results when applied to parallel constitutional clauses. If the method produces absurd results for parallel clauses, the method is invalid.

This is the "absurdity test" for constitutional interpretation. Constitutional provisions do not exist in isolation; they form an integrated structure. An interpretive method that works for one provision but fails for parallel provisions is not a valid method—it is an ad hoc rationalization for a preferred result.

Consider tariff delegation again. Article I, Section 8 assigns multiple powers to Congress using identical grammatical structure:

Clause	**Power Assigned to "The Congress"**
Cl. 1	**Lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises**
Cl. 2	Borrow Money on the credit of the United States
Cl. 5	Coin Money, regulate the Value thereof
Cl. 9	Constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court
Cl. 11	**Declare War**, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal
Cl. 12	Raise and support Armies

If legislative enactment can delegate the Duties power to the President, the same legislative mechanism must be capable of delegating parallel powers. Can Congress delegate the power to "Declare War" to the President? Can Congress delegate the power to "Coin Money" to

34 James Madison, Report on the Virginia Resolutions (1800), *reprinted in* 4 Elliot's Debates 546 (2d ed. 1891).

the President? Can Congress delegate the power to "Constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court" to the President?

These results are universally recognized as absurd. Congress cannot wholesale delegate the war power, the monetary power, or the tribunal-creation power. Yet the same constitutional structure applies to all Article I, Section 8 powers. The clauses use identical language assigning powers to "The Congress." If delegation is constitutionally impermissible for war declaration, it is constitutionally impermissible for tariff imposition. The interpretive method that validates tariff delegation would validate war-declaration delegation—and since the latter is absurd, the former must be invalid.

Step Four prevents interpretive manipulation. Courts cannot apply one method to reach a desired result in one case, then abandon that method when it produces undesired results in parallel cases. Constitutional interpretation must be consistent across the textual structure, or it is not interpretation at all—it is rationalization.

F. Step Five: Structural Impossibility Determination

The fifth step identifies whether the claimed action involves structurally non-delegable power. Certain constitutional features make delegation structurally impossible regardless of congressional intent.

Express assignment to specific positions: When the Constitution assigns power to a named position using mandatory language ("shall have Power," "shall be vested"), the assignment creates structural constraint. Congress cannot reassign what the Constitution assigned. The vesting clauses—Article I, Section 1 (legislative power vested in Congress), Article II, Section 1 (executive power vested in President), Article III, Section 1 (judicial power vested in federal courts)—create permanent structural assignments that congressional action cannot modify.

Procedural requirements: Certain powers are defined by procedural requirements that cannot be satisfied by different actors. The tariff power, for example, is constrained by Article I, Section 7's requirement that "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." Tariffs raise revenue. A presidential tariff bypasses House origination entirely. The structural requirement cannot be satisfied by executive action.

Incompatibility Clause confirmation: The Incompatibility Clause prohibits personal accumulation of legislative and executive power. This confirms the structural prohibition on institutional accumulation. If Congress could delegate legislative power to the executive, the Incompatibility Clause's personal prohibition would be trivially evaded.

Personal vs. positional assignment: Some powers are assigned personally, not positionally. The Pardon Power, for example, is assigned to "the President"—using personal language that identifies the specific officer, not the branch. The Take Care Clause uses the personal pronoun "he" to refer to the President. Personal assignments are structurally non-delegable because the Constitution identifies the specific actor who must exercise the power.

Step Five recognizes that some powers cannot be delegated regardless of how Congress phrases the delegation. The constitutional structure itself prohibits the transfer. No statute, however carefully drafted, can accomplish what the Constitution forbids.

G. Step Six: Position Indivisibility Analysis

The sixth step applies the principle of Position Indivisibility. Constitutional positions are defined by all provisions describing them. An actor claiming to exercise power assigned to a constitutional position must satisfy all definitional clauses for that position.

Consider the position "The Congress." This term appears throughout Article I as the recipient of assigned powers. But "The Congress" is not a mere label; it is defined by multiple constitutional provisions:

Definitional Clause	**Requirement**
Art. I, § 1	"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States"
Art. I, § 1	Congress "shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives"
Art. I, § 2	House composed of Members chosen by the People every second Year
Art. I, § 3	Senate composed of two Senators from each State
Art. I, § 7	Bills pass both Houses and are presented to President

When a power is assigned to "The Congress," it is assigned to the position defined by all these provisions. An actor claiming to exercise congressional power must satisfy all the definitional requirements. The President does not satisfy any of them:

- The President is not vested with legislative power (Article I, § 1)
- The President does not "consist of" Senate and House (Article I, § 1)
- The President is not composed of Members chosen by the People every second Year (Article I, § 2)
- The President is not composed of Senators from each State (Article I, § 3)

• Presidential actions do not pass both Houses with presentment to another President (Article I, § 7)

The President fails every definitional requirement for "The Congress." Therefore, the President cannot exercise powers the Constitution assigns to that position. The position is indivisible—you cannot have "The Congress" without bicameralism, without direct election of Representatives, without state selection of Senators. An actor who lacks these attributes is not "The Congress," regardless of what Congress may have enacted.

Step Six prevents definitional evasion. Congress cannot transfer its powers by simply labeling the transferee as its "delegate." The constitutional position includes all its defining characteristics. An actor who lacks those characteristics cannot exercise the position's powers.

H. The Grammatical Foundation: Constitutional Text as English Construction

The six-step test rests on a foundational premise that warrants explicit articulation: constitutional interpretation that disregards basic constructive principles of language—subject-predicate relationships, clausal relationships, and the role of punctuation in linguistic construction—is not interpretation at all. It is rewriting. The Constitution is written in English. English has grammatical rules. Those rules determine meaning independent of judicial preference.

Article II, Section 2 demonstrates this principle through its grammatical structure:

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.[35]

---

35 U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 1.

The grammatical structure is precise:

Element	**Function**	**Constitutional Effect**
"The President"	Grammatical subject	Identifies the Position of Assigned Power
Semicolons	Clause conjunctions	Connect multiple predicates to the same subject
"he"	Pronoun reference	Continues reference to "The President" as subject
"shall have Power to grant"	Predicate	Describes power belonging to the subject

The semicolon is not decorative punctuation. In English grammar, semicolons conjoin independent clauses that share a logical relationship—here, a shared grammatical subject. Each clause after the semicolon in Article II, Section 2 continues to describe powers of "The President." The subject does not change. The semicolon structure *requires* that "The President" remain the subject across all conjoined clauses.

The Grammatical Impossibility of Subject Substitution

The doctrine claiming prosecutorial immunity "derives" from the Pardon Power commits a grammatical impossibility: it substitutes "prosecutors" for "The President" as the grammatical subject while claiming the same predicate ("shall have Power to grant... Pardons") applies. This is not constitutional interpretation—it is subject-predicate substitution that violates basic English construction.

Stated as a grammatical syllogism:

Step	**Premise**
MAJOR	In Article II, Section 2, "The President" is the grammatical subject; semicolons conjoin predicates to that subject
MINOR	The claimed doctrine asserts exercise of a

	predicate ("grant... Pardons") assigned to "The President"
CONCLUSION	This requires changing the grammatical subject from "The President" to a different subject—which violates the sentence's grammatical structure

The Pronoun Proof

The text uses "he" to continue reference to "The President" throughout Section 2. "He may require the Opinion... he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons." The pronoun "he" grammatically refers to the antecedent noun—"The President." A doctrine claiming subordinates exercise this power must explain how "he" suddenly refers to those subordinates rather than to the President. No such explanation exists because the grammatical reference is unambiguous.

Constitutional Text Is Not a Policy Document

The Constitution is a legal instrument whose meaning derives from the words chosen and the grammatical structures employed. The Framers could have written: "The Executive Branch shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons." They did not. They wrote "The President shall have Power." The choice of "The President" over "The Executive Branch" is not stylistic preference—it is a substantive grammatical choice that determines meaning.

When courts or commentators claim that subordinate authority "derives" from a power assigned to a specific constitutional position, they commit interpretive substitution through grammatical operation:

Text Says	**Doctrine Claims**	**Grammatical Operation**
"The President... shall have Power to grant... Pardons"	Subordinates may exercise this power	Subject substitution: "The President" → subordinate
"he shall have Power"	They shall have power	Pronoun substitution: "he" → "they"

Semicolons conjoin clauses to single subject	Powers may be distributed to subordinates	Structural dissolution: single subject → multiple subjects

This is not interpretation. It is rewriting. The Constitution says "The President." No grammatical operation permits substituting a different subject while maintaining that the predicate ("shall have Power to grant... Pardons") remains valid. The subject and predicate are grammatically bound. Change the subject, and the predicate no longer applies.

The Universal Principle

This grammatical analysis applies to every constitutional provision. When the Constitution assigns power to a specific subject—"The Congress," "The President," "the judicial Power"—that assignment is grammatically fixed. Courts cannot substitute alternative subjects and claim the same predicates apply. The grammatical structure of constitutional text is not advisory; it is determinative of meaning.

The Universal Compliance Test's Position of Assigned Power analysis (Step Six) operationalizes this grammatical principle. The "Position of Assigned Power" *is* the grammatical subject of the constitutional clause. The definitional clauses that constitute that position are grammatically bound to the subject. A claim cannot selectively adopt the predicate ("shall have Power to grant Pardons," "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed," "shall have Power to declare War") while disclaiming the subject to which that predicate is grammatically assigned ("The President," "The Congress").

I. The Hierarchical Derivation Method

The Test's most powerful application is hierarchical derivation analysis—tracing any claimed authority through the complete chain of legal sources applicable to a specific Position of

Assigned Power. Every Position has a unique hierarchical structure through which authority flows: the Constitution (federal or state) sits at the apex, and each subsequent tier derives from and is constrained by all higher tiers. No lower-tier source can expand, contradict, or modify authority granted at a higher tier.

The methodology proceeds in five steps:

1. Identify the Position of Assigned Power being analyzed
2. Map the hierarchical tiers applicable to that specific position
3. Trace claimed authority through each tier
4. Test each derivation for constitutional validity
5. Identify the constraint point where claimed authority exceeds granted authority

Illustrative Hierarchy: Federal Magistrate Judge

For a federal magistrate judge, the hierarchy proceeds through four tiers:

Tier	**Source**	**Key Provisions**
1	U.S. Constitution	Art. III, § 1 (judicial power vested in courts); Art. II, § 2, cl. 2 (appointment of officers)
2	Federal Statutes	28 U.S.C. § 631 (appointment and tenure); 28 U.S.C. § 636 (jurisdiction, powers, and temporary assignment)
3	Federal Rules	Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, 73 (magistrate authority); Fed. R. Crim. P. 58, 59 (criminal matters)
4	District Orders	Standing orders; individual case referrals

This hierarchical structure applies universally—to Article III judges, prosecutors, the Speaker of the House, state attorneys general, or any other constitutionally-defined position. The

Universal Rule: at each tier, claimed authority must derive *from* a higher-tier grant. Authority cannot flow upward (a lower tier cannot create power the higher tier did not grant) and cannot skip tiers (a district standing order cannot expand magistrate authority beyond statutory limits).

Application to Magistrate Judge Authority

Magistrate Action	**Hierarchical Analysis**	**Result**
Issue search warrants	Tier 2 (§ 636(a)(1)) expressly authorizes	VALID
Conduct pretrial conferences	Tier 2 (§ 636(b)(1)(A)) authorizes with district court referral	VALID
Enter final judgment in felony trial	No tier authorizes without defendant consent; Art. III requires life-tenured judge	INVALID
Dismiss case with prejudice *sua sponte*	Exceeds Tier 2 authority; requires Art. III judge or consent	INVALID

The Test Operates at Every Tier

The six-step Madisonian analysis applies not only to constitutional questions but to each derivation point in the hierarchy. A state statute granting Attorney General authority must satisfy the Test against the state constitution; an administrative policy must satisfy the Test against enabling statutes. The methodology cascades through the entire structure, forcing explicit identification of each link in the derivation chain and revealing where chains are broken or fabricated.

Modern claims of governmental authority often obscure their derivation chains by invoking "inherent authority," "traditional practice," or "necessary discretion" without tracing the claimed power through applicable legal tiers. The hierarchical methodology forecloses such evasion. Every exercise of authority must trace through the hierarchy; what cannot be traced cannot be exercised.

J. The Oath Distinction: Why Delegation Fails Independently

A common defense of delegation argues that subordinate officers act as "delegates" of constitutionally-assigned positions—prosecutors as delegates of the President's Take Care duty, agency officials as delegates of congressional rulemaking authority. The Constitution forecloses this argument independent of the Position Indivisibility analysis. The Constitution establishes *distinct* oaths for different officers, creating *independent* constitutional duties that cannot be characterized as derivative.

Two Constitutionally Distinct Oaths

The President, under Article II, Section 1, Clause 8, swears:

> I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.[36]

Subordinate executive officers, federal prosecutors, and all federal officials take the Article VI, Clause 3 oath:

> The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution.[37]

The President's oath is unique: to "preserve, protect and defend" the Constitution. Subordinate officers take a different oath: to "support" the Constitution. This textual distinction

36 U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 8.
37 U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 3.

is dispositive. Subordinate duties are not derivative of the President's duty; they are *independently constituted* by their own oath.

Independent Constitutional Responsibility

Article VI, Clause 3 creates independent constitutional duty for every executive officer. Their responsibility derives from their own oath to "support this Constitution"—not from delegation of the President's personal duties. Madison's "will of its own" principle applies: each officer, bound by their own oath, has independent constitutional responsibility. An officer exercising claimed "derivative" presidential authority is substituting the President's will for their own independent constitutional duty—precisely what Madison warned against.

The Lawful Source of Subordinate Authority

The President's duty to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed" is personal to the Office of the President. It cannot be delegated because:

- The Take Care Clause uses "he"—a personal pronoun referring to the President
- Subordinate officers have their own oath creating independent constitutional duty
- No textual mechanism exists for transferring the President's personal duty to subordinates

Subordinate officers are bound by their own oath to "support this Constitution." Their lawful authority derives from: (a) their personal oath under Article VI, Clause 3; and (b) statutes enacted "in Pursuance" of the Constitution. It does NOT derive from delegation of the President's personal duties.

The oath distinction operates as an independent ground for invalidating delegation doctrines. Even if the Position Indivisibility analysis (Step 6) somehow permitted derivation—

which it does not—the oath distinction would still foreclose the result. Subordinate officers cannot derive authority from a position they did not occupy, with an oath they did not take, exercising a duty the Constitution assigned to a specific officer they are not.

PART IV: THE SUBSTANTIVE COLLAPSE OF STANDING DOCTRINE

IV. THE SUBSTANTIVE COLLAPSE OF STANDING DOCTRINE

A. Process Challenges vs. Violation Claims

The modern standing doctrine crystallized in *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* requires plaintiffs to demonstrate "injury in fact" that is "concrete and particularized" and "actual or imminent."[38] This doctrine is treated as constitutional bedrock—an immutable Article III requirement derived from the "Cases" and "Controversies" language.

This treatment rests on a fundamental error: the failure to distinguish between *process challenges* and *violation claims*. This distinction is not merely taxonomic—it determines whether Article III courts have constitutional jurisdiction to provide remedy.

A **process challenge** is a claim that challenges *how* a constitutional position exercises its validly-held powers. Process challenges ask courts to: (a) superintend constitutional amendment procedures; (b) second-guess legislative policy judgments within enumerated discretion; or (c) determine if statutory grants of standing comply with Article III. These challenges do not identify any constitutional provision that government *violated*—they dispute the *result* of completed constitutional processes or the *scope* of enumerated discretion.

---

38 Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992).

A **violation claim** is a claim that government has acted outside the constitutional assignment of powers—a Power Separation Vulnerability has occurred. Because the Constitution assigns all governmental powers to specific positions, every constitutional violation is fundamentally a separation of powers violation. A Power Separation Vulnerability occurs through:

PSV Type	**Definition**	**Example**
USURPATION	A position exercises power assigned to a *different* position	Executive imposes tariffs (Art. I, § 8 assigns to Congress)
ABDICATION	A position fails to exercise mandatory power assigned to it	Congress delegates legislative power without intelligible principle

This framework captures all constitutional violations because the Constitution operates as an integrated assignment document. Even Bill of Rights violations are Power Separation Vulnerabilities: when government infringes speech, it exercises power that Article I, Section 8 does not grant and that the First Amendment explicitly withholds—power that remains with the People under the Ninth and Tenth Amendments. The government has usurped power it was never assigned.

The critical distinction is therefore:

Dimension	**Process Challenge**	**Violation Claim**
What is challenged	Discretionary choices *within* validly-held powers	Actions *outside* constitutional power assignment
Constitutional process	Completed as designed	Violated or circumvented
Judicial role	Inappropriate—would superintend coordinate branches	Required—courts exist to remedy constitutional violations
Standing under pre-1938 equity	None—no remediable wrong	Permitted—shared injury cognizable

B. The Pre-1923 Doctrine

Before 1922, courts applied a fundamentally different standing analysis. Article III's "Cases" and "Controversies" language contains no particularization requirement. The text says nothing about injury being "different from the general public." These requirements were added by judicial construction over a century after ratification.

The Framers understood "Cases" and "Controversies" through the lens of English practice, which distinguished between courts of law (requiring specific individual harm for damages) and courts of equity (permitting suits to remedy structural wrongs affecting classes of people). Both were encompassed in Article III's grant.

Crampton v. Zabriskie (1879) established the doctrine of shared injury.[39] Hudson County taxpayers challenged illegal bond issuances. Justice Field, writing for a unanimous Court, declared:

> Of the right of resident tax-payers to invoke the interposition of a court of equity to prevent an illegal disposition of the moneys of the county, or the illegal creation of a debt which he **in common with other property holders** may otherwise be compelled to pay, there is at this day no serious question.[40]

The phrase "in common with other property holders" is decisive. The taxpayer's injury was not particularized—it was explicitly shared with all other property holders. Yet this shared injury was *sufficient* for equity jurisdiction. The Court did not require injury different from the general public; it required only that the plaintiff would bear the burden of illegal government action.

The Court explained:

39 Crampton v. Zabriskie, 101 U.S. 601 (1879).
40 *Id.* at 609 (emphasis added).

> From the nature of the powers exercised by municipal corporations, the great danger of their abuse and the necessity of prompt action to prevent irremediable injuries, it would seem eminently proper for courts of equity to interfere upon the application of the taxpayers of a county to prevent the consummation of a wrong, when the officers of those corporations assume, in excess of their powers, to create burdens upon propertyholders.[41]

Note the reasoning: equity courts should interfere because (a) government power is dangerous when abused, (b) prompt action is necessary to prevent irremediable harm, and (c) individual taxpayers are proper parties to bring such suits. None of this reasoning depends on particularized injury.

Crampton was decided 9-0. It has never been overruled. It remains good law for municipal taxpayers. The question is why its logic was abandoned for federal constitutional violations.

C. Fairchild v. Hughes: Correct but Narrow

Fairchild v. Hughes (1922) is frequently cited as the origin of the "generalized grievance" bar.[42] But properly understood, *Fairchild* was a narrow decision that does not support the broad doctrine later built upon it.

Charles Fairchild challenged the validity of the Nineteenth Amendment (women's suffrage). He sought to have the amendment declared unconstitutional and requested an injunction preventing the Secretary of State from proclaiming its ratification. Critically, Fairchild was not claiming that the government *violated* the Constitution—he was claiming that the Constitution *should not have been amended*. He attacked the Article V amendment process itself.

Justice Brandeis, writing for a unanimous Court, dismissed the case:

---

41 *Id.*
42 Fairchild v. Hughes, 258 U.S. 126 (1922).

> Plaintiff has only the right, possessed by every citizen, to require that the government be administered according to law and that the public moneys be not wasted. Obviously this general right does not entitle a private citizen to institute in the federal courts a suit to secure by indirection a determination whether a statute, if passed, or a constitutional amendment, about to be adopted, will be valid.[43]

This holding was correct—and for the same reason *Lujan* was correct. Citizens cannot use litigation to superintend the *amendment process* itself. The Nineteenth Amendment, once validly ratified, *was* the Constitution. Fairchild was not claiming a constitutional violation—he was claiming the Constitution itself was invalid.

This distinction is fundamental. When government violates an enumerated constitutional provision, the citizen seeks to *enforce* the Constitution as written. When a citizen challenges the amendment process, the citizen seeks to *override* the Constitution as amended. The former is the proper function of Article III courts; the latter is not.

Fairchild did not hold that citizens lack standing to challenge government *violations* of the Constitution. It held that citizens lack standing to challenge the constitutional *amendment process* itself.

D. Frothingham v. Mellon: The Improper Expansion

Frothingham v. Mellon (1923) took *Fairchild*'s narrow, defensible holding and expanded it into a general doctrine that contradicted a century of equity practice.[44]

Harriet Frothingham challenged the Sheppard-Towner Maternity Act of 1921, which distributed federal funds to states for programs reducing maternal and infant mortality. She argued that Congress exceeded its authority under the Tenth Amendment and that the statute

---

43 *Id.* at 129-30.
44 Frothingham v. Mellon, 262 U.S. 447 (1923).

would increase her tax burden. But this framing obscured what Frothingham was actually asking the Court to do.

The Tenth Amendment provides: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution... are reserved to the States."[45] Article I, Section 8 explicitly delegates to Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes... to pay the Debts and provide for the general Welfare of the United States."[46]

Frothingham's Tenth Amendment claim reduced to this question: Is funding maternal and infant health programs within Congress's enumerated "general Welfare" spending power? If yes, the Tenth Amendment does not apply—it reserves only powers "not delegated." If no, Congress exceeded its enumerated authority. Either way, Frothingham was asking the Court to define the *boundaries* of Congress's enumerated spending discretion—not to remedy a *violation* of an enumerated constitutional provision.

Justice Sutherland introduced the "minute and indeterminable" standard:

> The relation of a taxpayer of the United States to the federal government is very different [from a municipal taxpayer]. His interest in the moneys of the treasury—partly realized from taxation and partly from other sources—is shared with millions of others, is comparatively minute and indeterminable, and the effect upon future taxation, of any payment out of the funds, so remote, fluctuating and uncertain, that no basis is afforded for an appeal to the preventive powers of a court of equity.[47]

Sutherland then articulated what became the modern standing requirement:

> The party who invokes the power must be able to show not only that the statute is invalid but that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some

45 U.S. Const. amend. X (emphasis added).
46 U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 1.
47 *Frothingham*, 262 U.S. at 487.

> direct injury as the result of its enforcement, and not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally.[48]

This passage—"not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally"—became the foundation for the particularized injury requirement. But notice what Sutherland did: he took *Crampton*'s language about injury "in common with other property holders" and *inverted* it. What *Crampton* held was *sufficient* for standing, Sutherland declared was *insufficient*.

Frothingham may have been correctly decided—but for the wrong reason. The proper ground was that Frothingham posed a *process challenge*. She could not identify any constitutional provision that Congress *violated*. She could only argue that Congress's policy judgment about what falls within "general Welfare" was wrong—a policy dispute, not a constitutional violation. The *Crampton* doctrine permits standing for violation claims where government exceeds authority; it does not permit standing for process challenges where citizens dispute policy judgments within enumerated discretion.

The problem is what *Frothingham* became. Sutherland wrote broadly—"not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally"—without distinguishing process challenges from violation claims. Subsequent courts applied this language indiscriminately to all "generalized grievances," including genuine violation claims that pre-*Frothingham* equity courts would have entertained.

E. The Four Categories of Claims

The analysis yields a coherent framework with four categories:

Category	**Example**	**Proper Treatment**	**Reason**

48 *Id.* at 488.

Statutory process	Using ESA to create standing	No standing (*Lujan*)	Congress cannot override Article III
Amendment process	Challenging 19th Amendment	No standing (*Fairchild*)	Validly amended text *is* the Constitution
Spending discretion	Challenging "general Welfare" scope	No standing (*Frothingham*)	Courts don't superintend policy judgments
Violation claims	Executive acts where Constitution assigns power to Congress	Standing (*Crampton*)	Constitution violated; all citizens affected

The first three are process challenges (properly barred); the fourth—violation claims—warrants standing because textual violation, not policy dispute, occurred. *Crampton* remains good law, proving shared injury does not defeat standing when government exceeds authority.

Before *Frothingham*, "generalized grievances" for violation claims were cognizable in equity precisely because equity existed to remedy structural wrongs. A constitutional violation affecting everyone was *more* appropriate for judicial remedy, not less, because no individual plaintiff could claim sufficient damages to proceed at law.

After *Frothingham*, all "generalized grievances" became grounds for dismissal—regardless of whether they were process challenges (properly dismissed) or violation claims (improperly dismissed). The more widely shared the constitutional violation, the less likely any court could hear it. This inverted equity's constitutional function.

PART V: THE PROCEDURAL COLLAPSE: THE 1938 MERGER

V. THE PROCEDURAL COLLAPSE: THE 1938 MERGER

A. Article III's Dual Jurisdictional Grant

Article III, Section 2 provides: "The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in **Law and Equity**, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority..."[49]

The conjunction "and" joins two distinct jurisdictional grants—not synonyms employed for rhetorical emphasis, but separate categories carrying centuries of distinct jurisprudential character that the Framers deliberately preserved. If "Law" and "Equity" denoted the same jurisdictional grant, the Framers would have written one word. They wrote two because each does independent constitutional work.

B. The English Inheritance

Courts of Law and Courts of Equity existed as separate institutions in England for centuries before the Constitution was drafted.

Courts of Law—the King's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer—adjudicated legal claims before juries, awarded damages, and operated in a compensatory, backward-looking mode: what wrong occurred, and how shall the plaintiff be made whole?

Courts of Equity—principally Chancery—adjudicated equitable claims before the Chancellor alone, issued injunctions and declarations, and operated in a corrective, forward-looking mode: what wrong exists, and how shall it be stopped?

49 U.S. Const. art. III, § 2 (emphasis added).

Feature	**Courts of Law**	**Courts of Equity**
Function	Compensatory, backward-looking	Corrective, forward-looking
Question	"What wrong occurred? Compensate."	"What wrong exists? Stop it."
Remedy	Monetary damages	Injunctions, declarations, specific performance
Standing	Particularized harm required	Structural wrong sufficient
Trier	Jury	Chancellor

The Framers—many of whom were practicing lawyers intimately familiar with both systems—incorporated both into Article III's jurisdictional grant with full knowledge of their distinct characters.

Legal remedies are inherently particularized because compensation flows to a particular plaintiff for a particular injury. Equitable relief is inherently non-particularized because it operates on the conduct itself, not on the compensation of a specific individual. When a court declares an act unconstitutional or enjoins unlawful conduct, that declaration and that injunction benefit every person subject to that conduct—not one specific plaintiff.

Before 1938, the question "do you have standing?" had two different answers depending on which court you appeared in. At law, the court asked: "Were you injured?"—and the plaintiff showed particularized harm entitling them to damages. In equity, the court asked: "Is there a violation requiring remedy?"—and the plaintiff showed a wrong that equity should correct. The questions were different because the functions were different.

This was not procedural technicality—it was constitutional architecture ensuring that structural violations affecting everyone could be judicially remedied even when no single individual suffered harm distinguishable from the general public.

C. The Distinction Between "Case" and "Suit"

The Framers' precision extended to their choice of nouns. Article III uses both "Cases" and "Controversies," and the Judiciary Act of 1789 distinguished "suits in equity" from "actions at law." These were not synonyms employed for rhetorical variation.

"Case" derives from the Latin *casus*, meaning "a falling" or "that which befalls"—something that *happened* to the plaintiff. The word encodes a reactive posture: an event occurred, harm resulted, and the plaintiff seeks remedy for what befell them. This is the paradigm of legal jurisdiction: a past wrong requiring compensation.

"Suit" derives from the Latin *sequi*, meaning "to follow" or "to pursue." A suit is a *pursuit* of justice—a proactive invocation of the court's corrective power. The plaintiff need not have suffered a past harm distinguishable from others; they pursue the court's intervention to correct an ongoing wrong. This is the paradigm of equity jurisdiction: a present violation requiring correction.

The Framers, trained in the English legal tradition where this distinction carried jurisdictional significance, would not have used both terms carelessly. "Cases, in Law and Equity" extends judicial power to both paradigms: the reactive adjudication of past harms (law) and the proactive correction of ongoing wrongs (equity).

When courts today require "particularized injury" for all claims, they collapse this distinction. They treat every plaintiff as if seeking compensation for what *befell* them personally, ignoring equity's distinct function of correcting wrongs that affect the constitutional structure. The linguistic precision the Framers employed is lost, and with it, a jurisdictional category essential to constitutional enforcement.

D. The 1938 Merger

The merger of law and equity did not arise from constitutional deliberation. It arose from procedural reform movements focused on efficiency.

In 1848, David Dudley Field's New York Code of Procedure merged law and equity at the state level under the rationale that "simpler is better." Over the following decades, states followed New York's lead. In 1934, Congress passed the Rules Enabling Act, granting the Supreme Court authority to prescribe uniform federal procedure. In 1938, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure merged law and equity in federal courts—justified by the rationale that states had already done it and federal practice should be unified.

Charles E. Clark, Dean of Yale Law School, served as Reporter for the Advisory Committee on Rules. He was the primary architect and driving intellectual force behind the merger. Clark was deeply influenced by the Legal Realist movement, which dominated American legal academia in the 1920s-30s and viewed procedural distinctions as formalistic obstacles to substantive justice.

The merger was justified on grounds of administrative efficiency: the dual system required litigants to choose correctly between law and equity at the outset; choosing wrong meant dismissal and starting over; reformers argued this was wasteful and arbitrary; unified procedure would reduce technicalities.

Critically absent from this rationale: Any analysis of whether the *substantive* distinctions between legal and equitable jurisdiction—including distinct standing requirements—should be eliminated.

No reformer, no Advisory Committee member, no court adopting the rules ever argued:

• "Article III's distinction between Law and Equity is constitutionally meaningless"

• "The Framers did not intend functional differences between legal and equitable jurisdiction"

• "Standing requirements should be identical for damages claims and structural constitutional challenges"

• "The particularized injury requirement historically applied to equity"

• "Equity courts required plaintiffs to show harm distinguishable from the general public"

These constitutional questions were never addressed. The merger simply happened, and doctrine evolved in its wake without examining the foundation.

E. What the Merger Did Not Do

The Rules Enabling Act of 1934, which authorized the merger, explicitly states:

> Such rules shall not abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right.[50]

This limitation is not advisory. It is a statutory command defining the scope of the rulemaking power delegated to the Supreme Court.

Standing doctrine determines who may access Article III courts. It is not a procedural technicality—it is rooted in Article III's grant of "judicial Power" and its limitation to "Cases" and "Controversies." Standing is a substantive constitutional right.

If the 1938 procedural merger had the effect of modifying standing requirements—collapsing two distinct doctrines (legal and equitable standing) into one—it exceeded the authority granted by the Rules Enabling Act.

---

50 28 U.S.C. § 2072(b).

Alternatively, if the merger was within the Rules Enabling Act's authority because it was purely procedural, then it did not and could not modify the substantive constitutional distinction between legal and equitable standing.

Either way, the constitutional architecture survives.

Article III's text—"Cases, in Law and Equity"—remains unchanged. The merger did not amend the Constitution. The Framers' deliberate inclusion of both "Law" and "Equity" as distinct jurisdictional grants remains operative constitutional text.

No Supreme Court decision has ever held:

• That Article III's "Law and Equity" distinction is constitutionally meaningless

• That equity historically required particularized injury for standing

• That the 1938 merger eliminated substantive distinctions between legal and equitable jurisdiction

• That structural constitutional challenges require the same standing showing as damages claims

The courts simply stopped asking the question after 1938, and *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* crystallized an assumption that was never constitutionally examined.

PART VI: THE UNIFIED FRAMEWORK

VI. THE UNIFIED FRAMEWORK

A. Why Lujan Is Correct for Statutory Claims

Lujan's particularized injury requirement is logically sound when properly understood within its domain.

The Constitution establishes a process for statutory law: the Constitution authorizes Congress to legislate under Article I, and the Constitution authorizes agencies to interpret statutes through Article I delegation. Where does the will of the People lie on statutory matters? In the constitutional process itself—the legislative enactment and authorized agency interpretation.

When a petitioner claims to "speak for all Americans" on a statutory question—asserting that an agency misinterprets a statute—they are asking the judiciary to override the constitutionally authorized process. The petitioner substitutes their interpretation for Congress's delegation and the agency's expertise.

A judge cannot logically adjudicate this claim. The "will of the People" on statutory matters has already been expressed through the constitutional process. The judiciary's role is limited: review whether the agency acted within statutory bounds, not whether the petitioner's policy preference should prevail.

Therefore, *Lujan* correctly requires particularized injury for statutory claims. The court asks: "How did this statutory interpretation affect YOU specifically?" This ensures courts adjudicate concrete disputes about statutory application—not abstract policy disagreements where petitioners claim to speak for the People on matters the People have delegated to Congress.

B. Why Equitable Standing Is Correct for Constitutional Violations

Enumerated constitutional violations present a fundamentally different situation.

The Constitution is not the product of legislative process—it is the direct expression of the People's will through Article V ratification. Where does the will of the People lie on constitutional matters? In the Constitution itself. The People have spoken directly. No subsequent legislative or executive action can override what the People enacted through ratification.

When a petitioner claims that the government violated enumerated constitutional limits, they ARE speaking for all Americans—because all Americans share in the constitutional harm. The violation is against the document the People ratified. Every citizen has standing to enforce the People's direct expression against governmental overreach.

A judge not only CAN adjudicate this claim—it is the judiciary's core duty. As Chief Justice Marshall declared in *Marbury v. Madison*:

> It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.[51]

The Constitution IS "the law" that the judiciary must "say." When government exceeds enumerated constitutional limits, the judiciary interprets the People's direct will and enforces it against the offending branch. This is not judicial overreach—it is the constitutional design.

51 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803).

Therefore, Article III equity jurisdiction correctly permits citizen standing for enumerated constitutional violations. The petitioner speaks for the People because the Constitution speaks for the People. Particularized injury is not required because the harm is to the constitutional structure that protects everyone equally.

C. Bond v. United States: The Framework Confirmed

The Supreme Court confirmed this framework in *Bond v. United States*.[52] A unanimous Court held that individuals have standing to challenge federal action that exceeds constitutional limits:

> Federalism's limitations are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the States. In a proper case, a litigant may challenge a law as enacted in contravention of federalism, just as injured individuals may challenge actions that transgress, e.g., separation-of-powers limitations.[53]

The Court defined precisely when such challenges arise—when government exceeds its enumerated authority:

> By denying any one government complete jurisdiction over all the concerns of public life, federalism protects the liberty of the individual from arbitrary power. When government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake.[54]

This is precisely the equitable standing framework: government action that exceeds enumerated powers is a constitutional violation that individuals may challenge—not because they suffer injury different from others, but because the constitutional structure itself has been breached.

Justice Ginsburg's concurrence removed any ambiguity:

52 Bond v. United States, 564 U.S. 211 (2011).
53 *Id.* at 220-22.
54 *Id.* at 222.

> For this reason, a court has no "prudential" license to decline to consider whether the statute under which the defendant has been charged lacks constitutional application to her conduct.[55]

The *Bond* Court explicitly repudiated the contrary suggestion in *Tennessee Electric Power Co. v. TVA* (1939), which had implied that individuals could not raise structural constitutional challenges. Justice Kennedy's majority opinion declared *Tennessee Electric Power* to be "neither controlling nor instructive" and emphasized that the case "does not support the proposition that individuals are barred from asserting a federalism-based limitation in the courts."[56]

This repudiation is significant because *Tennessee Electric Power* had sometimes been cited for a broad proposition that structural constitutional provisions protect only governmental entities, not individuals. *Bond* rejected this reading decisively. The structural provisions—federalism, separation of powers—exist to protect individual liberty. When government exceeds structural limits, individuals are injured and may seek judicial remedy.

The implications are dispositive. After *Bond*, courts that dismiss citizen challenges to enumerated constitutional violations on "prudential" standing grounds violate *Bond*'s explicit holding that courts have "no prudential license" to decline such claims.

D. Bond's "Proper Case": Binary Violations and Concomitant Injury

Justice Kennedy's majority opinion in *Bond* qualified its holding repeatedly with the phrase "in a proper case"—without defining it.[57] He cautioned that "in some instances, the result may be that a State is the only entity capable of demonstrating the requisite injury."[58]

55 *Id.* at 226-27 (Ginsburg, J., concurring).
56 *Id.* at 223.
57 *Bond*, 564 U.S. at 220, 222-23.
58 *Id.* at 225.

Justice Ginsburg, concurring with Justice Breyer, reached the same result on narrower grounds: a criminal defendant has a "personal right not to be convicted under a constitutionally invalid law."[59] Under Ginsburg's framework, *Bond* standing operates only when the plaintiff is a defendant in a criminal proceeding, where standing is automatic by virtue of prosecution.

These two positions leave a critical gap. Kennedy's broader holding opens the door to civil plaintiffs challenging structural violations, but his "proper case" qualifier provides no criteria for identifying which civil cases qualify. Ginsburg's narrower holding closes the door entirely for non-criminal plaintiffs. Neither opinion addresses the question this framework presents: What happens when the structural violation is not a contested matter of policy or degree, but a *binary textual determination* facially apparent from the constitutional or statutory text?

Binary Textual Violations

A category of constitutional violations exists that warrants distinct treatment under *Bond*'s "proper case" qualifier. These are violations sharing three characteristics that distinguish them from generic "generalized grievances":

Characteristic	**What It Means**
Binary	Determinable from the text without factual development, policy judgment, or deference to any branch
Self-evident	Court can resolve the legal question by reading the provision
Concomitant injury	Cost of redress forced onto citizen by enforcement void

59 *Id.* at 226 (Ginsburg, J., concurring).

These are not policy disputes. They are not questions of degree. They are binary textual determinations:

Constitutional Provision	**The Binary Question**	**How It Is Resolved**
Art. I, § 7 (Origination Clause)	Did the revenue bill originate in the House or elsewhere?	Documentary record answers it
Art. I, § 8 (Tariff Power)	Does the Constitution assign tariff authority to Congress or to the Executive?	The text answers it
Art. II, § 2, cl. 2 (Treaty Power)	Does the Constitution require Senate advice and consent for treaties?	The text answers it
Statutory mandates	Does "shall investigate" impose a mandatory duty or grant discretion?	"Shall" is mandatory; the text answers it

These questions share three characteristics that make them paradigm candidates for individual standing under *Bond*'s "proper case" qualifier. First, they require no factual development—the answer is determined by reading the text. Second, they require no judicial policy judgment—the court declares what the text means, which is its core *Marbury* function. Third, they require no deference to any coordinate branch—because no branch possesses discretion to redefine mandatory text.

When Standing Collapses Into the Merits

When the legal question is facially determinable from the text, the standing inquiry cannot be harder than the merits inquiry. If "shall" plainly means mandatory, the merits are resolved by reading the statute. If a constitutional clause assigns power to a specific branch, the merits are resolved by reading the constitutional text. A binary textual violation disclaims any defense by its very character—the text leaves no room for the government's position, and no deference is owed to an interpretation the text forecloses.

The Supreme Court's own treatment of *Bond* on remand confirms this principle. In *Bond v. United States* (2014), the Court devoted twenty pages to a "fair reading" of 18 U.S.C. § 229, applying federalism presumptions, ordinary-meaning analysis, and the *Johnson v. United States* limiting principle to resolve *genuine* statutory ambiguity.[60] That interpretive effort was necessary because the statutory definition was "extremely broad" and required reconciliation with background constitutional principles. No comparable effort is required for binary textual violations. Where the *Bond* Court needed canons of construction, federalism presumptions, and ordinary-meaning analysis to reach a "fair reading," binary violations are resolved by reading the text—an exercise that requires no presumption, no canon, and no twenty-page analysis. If *Bond*'s genuine ambiguity warranted judicial resolution, violations that are facially apparent under the Court's own "fair reading" methodology are *a fortiori* cognizable.

Concomitant Injury

Kennedy recognized concomitant injury when he wrote that "[t]he unconstitutional action can cause concomitant injury to persons in individual cases."[61] "Concomitant" means necessarily accompanying—the injury arises from the structural violation itself, including the injury created by the need for redress. When no institution will enforce the text, the citizen who investigates and petitions bears the cost of enforcement that the constitutional structure assigned elsewhere. That cost is the concomitant injury.

This is not novel doctrine. Courts routinely award relief for injuries that arise concomitant to the pursuit of judicial remedy—attorney's fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988, investigation costs, litigation expenses. These costs do not precede the lawsuit; they result from it, and they are cognizable just as any non-concomitant injury. The enforcement costs borne by a

60 Bond v. United States, 572 U.S. 844, 856-66 (2014).
61 *Bond*, 564 U.S. at 225.

citizen who redresses a structural violation no institution will correct are doctrinally identical—and if anything, *more* compelling, because the costs were forced upon the citizen by the enforcement void rather than voluntarily undertaken.

The Three-Prong Test

The test for standing when a citizen seeks equitable relief for a structural violation can be stated precisely:

(a) Whether the underlying violation is binary—determinable from the text without factual development, policy judgment, or deference to any branch;

(b) Whether the merits are self-evident absent standing scrutiny—such that the court can resolve the legal question by reading the provision; and

(c) Whether concomitant injury—the cost of redress forced onto the citizen by the enforcement void—is cognizable without first satisfying the traditional standing test that presupposes uncertain merits.

Where all three are satisfied, standing doctrine's filtering function has nothing to filter. The citizen who identifies such a violation and seeks equitable relief—where no institutional actor has—does not need standing doctrine's permission to state the obvious. The citizen needs only Article III's "Equity" jurisdiction, which was designed for precisely this purpose.

The Floodgate Concern Forecloses Itself

This framework forecloses the "floodgate" concern that motivates restrictive standing doctrine. Only the citizen who actually bears the cost of redress—who investigates, documents, and litigates where no institution will—suffers the concomitant injury. Citizens who could identify a binary textual violation but do not act have no concomitant injury and no standing. The doctrine is self-regulating: the more serious the enforcement void, the higher the cost of redress, and the fewer citizens willing to bear it.

The framework therefore filters precisely the cases it should filter. Citizens who pursue political remedies, who advocate through ordinary democratic processes, who lobby legislators or join issue-based organizations—none of these citizens has incurred concomitant injury. Only the citizen who has actually borne the litigation cost forced onto them by institutional enforcement failure has the injury that opens the equitable forum.

E. Existing Doctrines That Already Recognize Binary Standing

The concomitant-injury / binary-violation principle has deep roots in doctrines the Supreme Court already recognizes. The framework does not create new standing categories; it identifies the unifying principle behind existing recognitions of standing for binary legal questions.

Heckler v. Chaney's Distinction

Heckler v. Chaney distinguishes discretionary non-enforcement (presumptively unreviewable) from denial of statutory authority (reviewable).[62] When an officer claims "I have no authority," the officer is not exercising discretion—the officer is making a legal determination subject to judicial review. The Court explicitly preserved review where the agency's "decision was based on its belief that it lacked jurisdiction" or where "the agency had 'consciously and expressly adopted a general policy' that is so extreme as to amount to an abdication of its statutory responsibilities."[63] In each instance, the binary legal question—does authority exist?—renders the standing analysis trivial compared to the merits analysis.

62 Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).
63 *Id.* at 833 n.4.

Dunlop v. Bachowski's Limitation

Dunlop v. Bachowski holds that agency refusal to act is reviewable when based on legal error.[64] When the Secretary of Labor declined to sue under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, the Court held the decision reviewable for legal sufficiency—the binary question whether the Secretary's stated reasons were legally adequate. The standing inquiry collapses into the legal-error inquiry; the merits resolve the standing.

The Mandamus Tradition

The mandamus tradition, tracing to *Marbury* itself, compels performance of ministerial (non-discretionary) duties.[65] *Marbury* held that where Madison had a clear legal duty to deliver Marbury's commission, the binary character of the duty—it existed or it did not—made standing analysis indistinguishable from merits analysis. The Court did not require Marbury to demonstrate particularized injury beyond the deprivation of his commission; the legal entitlement *was* the injury.

The Common Principle

In each existing doctrine, the binary character of the legal question—duty exists or it does not, authority exists or it does not, the text says what it says or it does not—renders the standing analysis trivial compared to the merits analysis. The framework this Article advances identifies the unifying principle: when the legal question is binary, the standing question collapses into the merits question. The framework does not create new standing law; it identifies the constitutional logic that already animates *Heckler*, *Dunlop*, *Marbury*, and the broader mandamus tradition.

64 Dunlop v. Bachowski, 421 U.S. 560, 572-75 (1975).
65 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 168-73 (1803).

The existing framework inverts this relationship. Under *Lujan*, a plaintiff challenging a binary textual violation must first demonstrate particularized injury—proving standing requires more judicial effort than resolving the merits. The court expends resources determining whether the plaintiff is the right person to state the obvious, when the obvious could be stated in one sentence. This is not judicial economy. It is constitutional dysfunction.

F. The Two Sources of Law

The apparent tension between *Lujan* and equitable standing for constitutional violations dissolves when the source of law is properly identified:

Dimension	**Statutory Law**	**Constitutional Law**
Source	Congress + agency interpretation	The People (Article V ratification)
Will of People	Expressed through legislative process	Expressed DIRECTLY in Constitution
Can petitioner speak for all?	NO (would override process)	YES (enforces People's direct will)
Judicial role	Review statutory application to plaintiff	"Say what the law is" (*Marbury*)
Standing required	Particularized injury (*Lujan*)	Citizenship (traditional equity)

Lujan is correct where it applies. For statutory claims, the will of the People lies in Congress. A petitioner cannot claim universal standing because that would substitute judicial policy-making for the constitutional legislative process.

Equitable standing is equally correct where it applies. For enumerated constitutional violations, the will of the People lies in the Constitution itself. A citizen CAN claim equitable standing because the Constitution is the People's direct expression, and every citizen shares in its violation.

The Law/Equity framework does not overrule *Lujan* or create tension with existing doctrine. It completes *Lujan* by identifying its proper domain. The 1938 procedural merger obscured this distinction by collapsing all claims into a single procedural form. *Lujan* then developed a unified standing test without asking whether that test should apply differently to different sources of law. The recovery of Article III's equity jurisdiction recovers the distinction.

PART VII: APPLICATIONS OF THE OBJECTIVE TEST

VII. APPLICATIONS OF THE OBJECTIVE TEST

This Part applies the Madisonian six-step test to seven constitutional questions. All seven fail, establishing their constitutional invalidity through objective textual analysis.

A. Tariff Delegation

Constitutional Provision: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 assigns the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" to Congress.

Challenged Action: Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974 purports to delegate tariff-imposing authority to the President.[66]

> **Step 1 (Clause Identification)** : The Duties power is assigned by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 to "The Congress."
>
> **Step 2 (Classification)** : Section 122 is a legislative enactment that must be "made in Pursuance" of the Constitution.
>
> **Step 3 (Syllogism)** : The claimed syllogism is:
> • MAJOR: "The Congress shall have Power To lay... Duties"

66 19 U.S.C. § 2132.

• MINOR: Section 122 is law "in Pursuance thereof" delegating this power to the President

• CONCLUSION: President may impose tariffs as delegate of congressional power

The Minor Premise must survive the textual consistency test.

Step 4 (Textual Consistency) : Article I, Section 8 assigns multiple powers to "The Congress" using identical structure. If Congress can delegate the Duties power, the same mechanism must delegate parallel powers:

Parallel Clause	**Can Statute Delegate to President?**
Borrow Money	No
Coin Money, regulate Value	No
Constitute inferior Tribunals	No
Declare War	**No** — universally recognized
Lay Duties	**By consistency: NO**

The absurdity test: If Section 122 is constitutional, then Congress could enact "Section 123: The President may Declare War whenever he determines national security requires." This is manifestly unconstitutional. Section 122 differs only in subject matter, not constitutional structure. **FAILS**.

Step 5 (Structural Impossibility) : The tariff power is structurally non-delegable:

• Express assignment to "The Congress"

• Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 requires "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House"—tariffs raise revenue; executive tariffs bypass House origination

• Incompatibility Clause confirms: if personal accumulation forbidden, institutional accumulation forbidden a fortiori

FAILS.

Step 6 (Position Indivisibility) : The President does not satisfy ANY definitional clause for "The Congress":

• Not vested with legislative power (Art. I, § 1)

• Not bicameral (Art. I, § 1)

• Not chosen by the People for legislative function (Art. I, § 2)

• Not composed of Senators from each State (Art. I, § 3)

• Actions do not pass both Houses (Art. I, § 7)

FAILS.

RESULT: Tariff delegation fails Steps 4, 5, and 6. Section 122 and all similar delegations are **UNCONSTITUTIONAL**. Executive-imposed tariffs are void ab initio.

Recent Confirmation: Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump (2026)

The Supreme Court's decision in *Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump* confirms this analysis.[67] The Court rejected the executive's claim that the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) delegated unilateral tariff authority, holding:

> When Congress grants the power to impose tariffs, it does so clearly and with careful constraints. It did neither here.[68]

The decision tracks the Test precisely. The Court's holding that IEEPA does not grant tariff authority confirms Step 1 (no clause expressly delegates this power to the executive) and Step 3 (no valid syllogism connects IEEPA's regulatory language to tariff-imposing authority). The Court's emphasis on "careful constraints" reflects the structural impossibility identified at Step 5—the Origination Clause requires that revenue measures begin in the House, which executive tariffs structurally bypass.

67 Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump, 607 U.S. ___, slip op. at 17 (2026).
68 *Id.*

The parallel to *Lujan* is precise. In *Lujan*, the claim was that the Endangered Species Act granted citizen standing; the Court held Congress cannot override Article III. In *Learning Resources*, the claim was that IEEPA granted presidential tariff power; the Court held Congress cannot delegate away Article I, Section 8. Both cases answer the same question: Can an Act of Congress circumvent an enumerated constitutional power? The answer is no.

Yet the system treats these identical constitutional errors asymmetrically. The citizen is gatekept by the judiciary—standing doctrine stops the suit before the constitutional question is addressed. The executive acts freely until sued—constitutional harm accumulates in the billions while litigation proceeds. Within hours of *Learning Resources*, the executive invoked Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974—demonstrating that narrow statutory rulings permit continued violation through alternative statutory paths, which is the structural defect equitable standing would resolve.

B. Qualified Immunity

Constitutional Provisions: Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5 assigns enforcement power to Congress. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides that "every person" who deprives constitutional rights "shall be liable."

Challenged Action: Judicial doctrine shields officials from liability unless violated right was "clearly established."[69]

Step 1 (Clause Identification) : The Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5 assigns enforcement power to "The Congress."

Step 2 (Classification) : Qualified immunity is a judicial doctrine.

Step 3 (Syllogism) : The claimed syllogism is:

69 *See* Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982).

• MAJOR: Congress enacted § 1983 pursuant to Fourteenth Amendment enforcement power

• MINOR: Qualified immunity is valid interpretation of § 1983 incorporating common law

• CONCLUSION: Qualified immunity is constitutional limitation on § 1983 liability

Step 4 (Textual Consistency) : Section 1983 provides "Every person... shall be liable." If courts can read "qualified immunity" into "shall be liable," they can read:

• "Qualified speech immunity" into "Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech"

• "Qualified search immunity" into "shall not be violated"

These results are absurd. The interpretive method is invalid. **FAILS**.

Step 5 (Structural Impossibility) : Qualified immunity is judicial legislation:

• Article I, Section 1: "All legislative Powers... vested in a Congress"—creating immunity where Congress enacted liability is legislative

• Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5: "The Congress shall have power to enforce"—Congress determined "shall be liable"; courts cannot override

FAILS.

Step 6 (Position Indivisibility) : Courts do not satisfy definitional clauses for "The Congress" assigned enforcement authority. **FAILS**.

RESULT: Qualified immunity fails Steps 4, 5, and 6. The doctrine is **UNCONSTITUTIONAL** judicial legislation.

The Nine Specific Failures of Harlow v. Fitzgerald

The qualified immunity doctrine's constitutional defects extend beyond the textual consistency failure. *Harlow v. Fitzgerald* contains at least nine specific analytical failures that compound its unconstitutionality:

1. The "Essentially Objective" Logical Fallacy

Harlow announced that the new standard would "permit the resolution of many insubstantial claims on summary judgment" through a standard that is "essentially objective."[70] But objectivity is binary—a standard is either objective or it is not. There are no degrees of objectivity. "Essentially objective" is an oxymoron, equivalent to "somewhat pregnant." The doctrine's foundational formulation contains a logical impossibility.

2. The Malice Elimination Problem

Harlow eliminated the subjective malice inquiry because discovery into officials' mental states was deemed too burdensome. But this means an officer who *knowingly* violates constitutional rights receives the same protection as one who acts in genuine good faith. The doctrine cannot distinguish between the ignorant and the malicious—a distinction fundamental to any coherent immunity framework.

3. The "Clearly Established" Catch-22

For a right to be "clearly established," prior precedent must have addressed materially similar facts. But if no prior case exists, the right is not clearly established. If the right is not clearly established, the officer receives immunity. If the officer receives immunity, no precedent is created. The doctrine creates a logical trap where rights can never become clearly established because the immunity prevents the cases that would establish them.

4. The Ninth Amendment Inversion

70 *Harlow*, 457 U.S. at 818.

The Ninth Amendment provides: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." This establishes that legal uncertainty about the scope of rights should be resolved in *favor* of the citizen. Qualified immunity inverts this: legal uncertainty about whether a right is "clearly established" is resolved in favor of the *officer*. The doctrine contradicts the Constitution's express instruction about how to treat rights-related uncertainty.

5. The *Butz* Burden Shift

In *Butz v. Economou* (1978), the Court held that officials must "show that they acted in good faith" to claim immunity.[71] *Harlow* transformed this: now the *citizen* must overcome immunity by showing the right was clearly established. This silent reversal of burden—from official must show good faith to citizen must show clear establishment—occurred without constitutional justification.

6. The Seventh Amendment Violation

The Seventh Amendment guarantees: "In Suits at common law... the right of trial by jury shall be preserved." *Harlow* explicitly sought to prevent jury trials: the doctrine's purpose is to permit "resolution... on summary judgment" and protect officials from "the general costs of subjecting officials to the risks of trial."[72] A doctrine whose express purpose is to eliminate jury trials in civil rights cases violates the Amendment that guarantees them.

7. The Common Law Fiction

Harlow claims to derive qualified immunity from common law principles existing in 1871 when § 1983 was enacted. But constitutional rights did not exist at common law—the

71 Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478, 498 (1978).
72 *Harlow*, 457 U.S. at 818.

Constitution created them. There could be no common law immunity for violating rights that common law did not recognize. The historical foundation claimed for the doctrine is fictitious.

8. The Judicial Self-Dealing Problem

The qualified immunity doctrine was created by judges, protects judges (through absolute judicial immunity, qualified immunity's sibling doctrine), and insulates prosecutors and executive officials who work within the legal system. The doctrine's architects are among its beneficiaries. This structural self-dealing undermines the doctrine's legitimacy independent of its constitutional defects.

9. The Seven Constitutional Violations

Qualified immunity violates at least seven constitutional provisions:

• Article I, Section 6 (Speech or Debate Clause—by implication, if Congress intended immunity for other officials, it would have enumerated them as it did for legislators)

• Article III (by permitting non-judicial creation of immunity the Constitution does not provide)

• Article IV, Section 2 (Privileges and Immunities—citizens of different states may receive different immunity treatment depending on circuit precedent)

• Article V (by effectively amending the Fourteenth Amendment without the amendment process)

• Seventh Amendment (jury trial right)

• Ninth Amendment (treatment of unenumerated rights)

• Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection; due process)

C. Revenue Bill Origination

Constitutional Provision: Article I, Section 7, Clause 1: "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

Challenged Pattern: Executive branch drafting of revenue legislation subsequently introduced by House members as a formality.

Step 1 (Clause Identification) : The Origination Clause assigns revenue bill origination to "the House of Representatives."

Step 2 (Classification) : Executive drafting of revenue legislation is executive pre-enforcement—the Executive Branch drafting legislation the Constitution requires originate in the House.

Step 3 (Syllogism) : The claimed syllogism asserts that formal House introduction satisfies "originate" regardless of actual authorship. But "originate" means "to give rise to; to begin." A bill drafted by the Executive and merely introduced by a House member does not "originate" in the House—it originates in the Executive and is laundered through the House.

In *United States v. Munoz-Flores* (1990), the Supreme Court addressed the Origination Clause but did not resolve whether executive drafting violates the origination requirement.[73] The Court's narrow holding—that a statute need only be a "Bill for raising Revenue" to trigger the Clause—left open the question of substantive versus formal origination.

Step 4 (Textual Consistency) : If "originate in the House" is satisfied by formal introduction despite Executive drafting, then "passed the House and Senate" would be satisfied by formal notation despite never being voted on. This is absurd. Constitutional process requirements demand substantive compliance, not formal gestures. **FAILS**.

Step 5 (Structural Impossibility) : The Origination Clause exists because the House, with proportional representation and direct election (originally the only directly-elected federal body), was considered closest to the people who bear the tax burden. Executive origination defeats this structural purpose entirely. The Take Care Clause assigns the Executive to execute laws, not originate them. **FAILS**.

Step 6 (Position Indivisibility) : The Executive does not satisfy any definitional clause for "House of Representatives":

73 United States v. Munoz-Flores, 495 U.S. 385 (1990).

• Not composed of members chosen by the People every second Year (Art. I, § 2)

• Not apportioned among the States according to population

• Does not select a Speaker from its members

FAILS.

RESULT: Executive origination of revenue bills, even when formally introduced by House members, fails Steps 3, 4, 5, and 6. Such bills **violate the Origination Clause**.

D. IEEPA Tariff Authority

Constitutional Provision: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 assigns the Duties power to Congress.

Challenged Action: Executive tariffs imposed under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.[74]

Analysis: IEEPA fails for all reasons stated in Test A (Tariff Delegation), plus a fundamental statutory misreading:

IEEPA's text authorizes the President to "investigate, block during the pendency of an investigation, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property."[75]

This language authorizes regulatory authority over *property and transactions*—not tariff-imposing authority. The statute contains no mention of tariffs, duties, imposts, or revenue. When Congress intends to grant tariff authority, it does so explicitly with careful constraints, as in Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (national security tariffs with specific

74 50 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.
75 50 U.S.C. § 1702(a)(1)(B).

procedural requirements) or Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (retaliatory tariffs with investigation requirements).

IEEPA's emergency powers concern blocking transactions and freezing assets—quintessentially regulatory functions. Reading tariff authority into IEEPA would transform every emergency economic statute into a backdoor revenue-raising mechanism, circumventing the Origination Clause requirement that revenue bills begin in the House.

RESULT: IEEPA tariff authority is **UNCONSTITUTIONAL**. Executive tariffs under IEEPA exceed the statute's grant and violate Article I's assignment of the tariff power to Congress.

E. Administrative Rulemaking

Constitutional Provision: Article I, Section 1: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

Challenged Action: Agency rules with the force of law promulgated under enabling statutes.

Step 3 (Syllogism) : The claimed syllogism contains a logical contradiction:

• MAJOR: "All legislative Powers... shall be vested in a Congress"

• MINOR: Enabling statutes are law "in Pursuance thereof" permitting Congress to delegate rulemaking

A law "in Pursuance" of the clause vesting "all legislative Powers" in Congress cannot simultaneously transfer those powers elsewhere. A law pursuant to exclusive vesting cannot divest. **FAILS**.

Step 4 (Textual Consistency) : If "All legislative Powers... vested in a Congress" permits delegation, then "The executive Power shall be vested in a President" permits delegation to Congress. This is absurd. **FAILS**.

Step 5 (Structural Impossibility) : The Legislative Vesting Clause uses "All," "vested," and "shall be"—universal, mandatory, exclusive language. Delegation contradicts each element. **FAILS**.

Step 6 (Position Indivisibility) : Agencies are not "a Congress." They have neither Senate nor House. **FAILS**.

RESULT: Administrative rulemaking delegation fails Steps 3, 4, 5, and 6. To the extent it constitutes exercise of legislative power, it **lacks constitutional foundation**.

F. Impoundment

Constitutional Provisions: Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 (Appropriations Clause); Article II, Section 3 (Take Care Clause).

Challenged Action: Executive refusal to spend funds Congress has appropriated.

Step 3 (Syllogism) : The Minor Premise misreads the Appropriations Clause. "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" establishes appropriation as the *necessary condition* for expenditure—not as merely *permissive*. Once appropriated, the constitutional condition is satisfied. **FAILS**.

Step 4 (Textual Consistency) : If the Executive may decline to execute appropriation laws, the same discretion permits declining to execute any law. This would make the Take Care Clause meaningless. **FAILS**.

Step 5 (Structural Impossibility) : The Take Care Clause requires the President to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." Appropriations are laws. Faithful execution means spending appropriated funds. **FAILS**.

Step 6 (Position Indivisibility) : The appropriation/non-appropriation decision belongs to Congress, not the Executive. **FAILS**.

RESULT: Impoundment fails Steps 3, 4, 5, and 6. It is **UNCONSTITUTIONAL**.

G. Prosecutorial Non-Prosecution Agreements

Constitutional Provisions: Article II, Section 2 (Pardon Power); Article II, Section 3 (Take Care Clause).

Challenged Action: Prosecutors granting effective immunity through non-prosecution agreements without statutory authorization.

Step 4 (Textual Consistency) :
For Pardon Power derivation: If prosecutorial discretion derives from the Pardon Power, the same derivation applies to parallel Article II, Section 2 clauses. Prosecutors cannot command military, make treaties, or appoint ambassadors. **FAILS**.

For Take Care derivation: The Take Care Clause uses personal pronoun "he" referring to the President. Subordinate officers have independent oath under Article VI. No textual mechanism transfers the President's personal duty. **FAILS**.

Step 5 (Structural Impossibility) : The Pardon Power is assigned personally to "the President"—not positionally. Historical derivation from royal prerogative vested in single accountable officer confirms personal, non-delegable nature. **FAILS**.

Step 6 (Position Indivisibility) : Prosecutors are not "the President":

- Not vested with executive power through Electoral selection
- Different oath (Article VI vs. Article II, Section 1, Clause 8)

FAILS.

RESULT: Prosecutorial NPAs claiming constitutional immunity-granting authority fail Steps 4, 5, and 6. They are **UNCONSTITUTIONAL**. The sole valid immunity mechanism is 18 U.S.C. §§ 6001-6005 (use immunity with court order and Attorney General approval).

PART VIII: HISTORICAL VALIDATION

VIII. HISTORICAL VALIDATION

A. Methodology

The Madisonian Test can be validated by applying it to coordinate government actions the Supreme Court has already found unconstitutional. If the Test produces "UNCONSTITUTIONAL" for actions the Court invalidated, the methodology is validated as consistent with established constitutional jurisprudence.

This validation was performed for 36 Supreme Court decisions spanning 154 years (1872-2021).

B. Results

Test	**Case**	**Year**	**Issue**	**Madisonian Result**	**Court Holding**	**Match**
H	*INS v. Chadha*	1983	Legislative veto	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	✓
I	*Clinton v. City of New York*	1998	Line item veto	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	✓
J	*Youngstown v. Sawyer*	1952	Steel seizure	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	✓
K	*Schechter Poultry*	1935	NIRA delegation	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	✓
L	*Bowsher v. Synar*	1986	Comptroller removal	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	✓

M	*Panama Refining*	1935	"Hot oil" delegation	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
N	*Printz v. United States*	1997	Commande ering officers	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
O	*New York v. United States*	1992	Commande ering legislatures	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
P	*Seila Law v. CFPB*	2020	Single-director removal	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
Q	*Buckley v. Valeo*	1976	Congressio nal appointme nt	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
R	*Free Enterprise Fund*	2010	Dual for-cause removal	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
S	*Northern Pipeline*	1982	Non-Article III adjudicatio n	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
T	*Plaut v. Spendthrift*	1995	Reopening final judgments	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
U	*Collins v. Yellen*	2021	FHFA removal	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
V	*Arthrex*	2021	APJ final authority	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
W	*Lucia v. SEC*	2018	ALJ appointme nt	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
X	*MWAA*	1991	Congressio nal board	UNCONS TITUTION AL	UNCONS TITUTION AL	✓
Y	*United States v.*	1872	Prescribing judicial	UNCONS TITUTION	UNCONS TITUTION	✓

	Klein		outcomes	AL	AL	
Z	*Zivotofsky v. Kerry*	2015	Congressional recognition	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	✓
AA	*NLRB v. Noel Canning*	2014	Recess appointments	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	✓
...	*[16 additional cases]*	1936-2018	Various	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	UNCONSTITUTIONAL	✓
AY	*Bond v. United States*	2011	Individual federalism standing	STANDING CONFIRMED	STANDING GRANTED	✓

Total: 36/36 (100% correspondence)

Every unconstitutional action fails all four substantive steps (Steps 3-6). This reflects the integrated nature of constitutional structure—an action that violates separation of powers typically:

- Cannot construct a valid syllogism
- Fails textual consistency
- Is structurally impossible
- Fails position indivisibility

C. Implications

The perfect correspondence between Madisonian Test results and Supreme Court holdings validates the methodology. When the Court has addressed the coordinate action, it reached the same conclusion the Madisonian Test produces.

This validation supports applying the Test to coordinate actions the Court has not yet addressed (Tests A-G). The test correctly identifies unconstitutional actions across 154 years of jurisprudence; there is no reason to believe it fails for actions the Court has not yet reviewed.

The Logical Bind

The 36/36 validation demonstrates that the Test is not outcome-driven—a critic cannot claim the methodology is designed to produce politically convenient results when it perfectly replicates 154 years of Supreme Court jurisprudence. Officials and courts face a dilemma when confronting the Test's application to coordinate actions not yet adjudicated:

(a) Accept the methodology and accept its results for untested coordinate actions (tariff delegation, qualified immunity, administrative rulemaking, prosecutorial immunity grants, executive treaty withdrawal, executive origination of revenue bills, impoundment); *or*

(b) Reject the methodology and explain why it works perfectly for the thirty-six cases the Supreme Court decided but fails for actions officials prefer not to examine.

There is no third option. The Test is either valid—in which case its untested results stand—or it is invalid—in which case the Supreme Court reached its conclusions in those thirty-six cases through some other mechanism that critics must identify and reconcile with the Test's perfect correspondence.

Burden Shift

With 36/36 proven accuracy, the burden shifts. Anyone claiming that the Test errs when applied to a specific coordinate action must explain what distinguishes that action from the thirty-six the Court has decided. The six-step methodology reveals no principled distinction. The Test asks the same questions of all coordinate actions:

• Does a constitutional clause assign the power? (Step 1)

• What type of coordinate action is claimed? (Step 2)

• Can a valid syllogism be constructed? (Step 3)

• Does the interpretive method work for parallel clauses? (Step 4)

• Is the power structurally non-delegable? (Step 5)

• Does the actor satisfy all definitional clauses for the assigned position? (Step 6)

These questions do not vary based on which coordinate action is examined. The only intellectually honest position is that the Test identifies constitutional structure violations consistently, whether or not the results are politically comfortable to address.

Implications for Pending Applications

The validated Madisonian Test produces "UNCONSTITUTIONAL" for coordinate actions including:

• Tariff delegation under Section 122 and IEEPA (confirmed by *Learning Resources v. Trump* (2026))

• Qualified immunity doctrine

• Executive origination of revenue bills

• Administrative rulemaking as legislative delegation

• Impoundment authority

• Prosecutorial non-prosecution agreements granting immunity

• Executive unilateral treaty withdrawal where the Constitution assigns advice and consent to the Senate

The Test correctly identifies unconstitutional actions across 154 years of Supreme Court jurisprudence; there is no reason to believe it fails for actions the Court has not yet reviewed. The

Court's invalidation of executive tariff authority under IEEPA in *Learning Resources*—within months of the framework's articulation—provides confirmation that the methodology tracks how the Court actually decides such questions when it reaches them.

PART IX: THE CONSTITUTIONAL NECESSITY OF JUDICIAL ADOPTION

IX. THE CONSTITUTIONAL NECESSITY OF JUDICIAL ADOPTION

A. The War Powers Pattern

The absence of an objective test produces consequences measured in lives. The pattern repeats across administrations: executives commit forces to combat without congressional authorization, claim defensive or emergency justification, and by the time constitutional challenges reach courts, the conflict has created facts on the ground that make judicial intervention seem impractical.

Korea (1950): President Truman committed American forces to combat in Korea without congressional declaration or authorization. When questioned, he characterized the deployment as a "police action" under United Nations authority. Over 36,000 American service members died. Congress never declared war.[76]

Vietnam (1964-1973): The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution authorized the President to "take all necessary measures" to repel armed attack and prevent further aggression. This broad language—enacted based on disputed incident reports—became the basis for a decade of major

76 The constitutional questions were never judicially resolved. *See* Louis Fisher, *Presidential War Power* 70-91 (2d ed. 2004).

combat operations. Over 58,000 American service members died under authorization that many later argued exceeded constitutional bounds.[77]

Kosovo (1999): President Clinton conducted a 78-day bombing campaign against Serbia without congressional authorization. The House of Representatives voted against a declaration of war and declined to authorize the air operations, yet the campaign continued. The D.C. Circuit dismissed a lawsuit by members of Congress, holding they lacked standing—a result that demonstrates the framework gap this Article addresses.[78]

Libya (2011): President Obama ordered military operations against Libya that continued beyond the War Powers Resolution's 60-day limit. The administration argued the operations did not constitute "hostilities" under the Resolution—despite ongoing airstrikes—because there were no ground troops and limited risk of American casualties. This interpretive maneuver illustrates how subjective statutory language permits executive self-certification.[79]

The pattern is consistent: executives act first, claim justification under broad statutory or inherent authority, and constitutional questions are either never adjudicated or dismissed on procedural grounds. Meanwhile, Americans die in conflicts that may lack constitutional foundation.

B. The Subjective Qualifier Defect

The War Powers Resolution suffers from the same subjective qualifier defect that plagues the judicial doctrines examined throughout this Article.

---

77 The War Powers Resolution of 1973 was Congress's attempt to reassert its constitutional role, but as discussed below, its subjective standards have proven ineffective.

78 Campbell v. Clinton, 203 F.3d 19 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

79 Charlie Savage, *Barack Obama's Q&A Session on Libya and War Powers*, N.Y. Times, June 15, 2011, at A1.

Section 1543(a) requires presidential reporting when forces are introduced "into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances."[80] But the statute provides no objective metrics: What is "imminent"? What is "clearly indicated"? The Executive self-certifies.

This is the "essentially objective" fallacy identified in *Harlow*.[81] A standard is either objective or it is not; objectivity admits no degrees. "Clearly imminent" is no more objective than "essentially objective."

Libya exposed this defect starkly: the administration argued that sustained bombing operations were not "hostilities" because American casualties were unlikely. Under this interpretation, any technologically superior military action—drone strikes, cruise missiles, cyber attacks—could evade the Resolution entirely. The subjective qualifier permits the Executive to define its own constraints.

C. Congressional Abdication as Structural Pattern

The historical record reveals a pattern of congressional abdication that compounds executive overreach. This pattern—consistent failure to exercise constitutional checking functions across administrations, parties, and decades—suggests structural dysfunction rather than isolated policy choices.

Consider the evidence:

• Korea: No declaration despite years of major combat

• Vietnam: Broad authorization based on disputed intelligence, followed by decade without reassessment

80 50 U.S.C. § 1543(a)(1).
81 *See* Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 818-19 (1982).

• Kosovo: House voted against authorization; operations continued; no consequence

• Libya: Operations exceeded 60-day limit; no enforcement

• Ongoing: Authorizations for Use of Military Force from 2001 and 2002 remain in effect, cited as authority for operations their drafters never contemplated

When conduct against institutional self-interest becomes uniform across extended time periods, the inference of structural failure becomes compelling. Congress has constitutional authority—and duty—to check executive war-making. Its consistent failure to do so, regardless of which party controls which branch, suggests the political process cannot be relied upon to enforce constitutional boundaries.

This is precisely the circumstance where judicial enforcement becomes necessary. As Madison warned, "parchment barriers" are insufficient when the branches that should check each other instead accommodate each other's overreach.

D. The Framework Gap in Practice

The framework gap produces consequences beyond war powers. In every domain where the Constitution assigns power to Congress, the absence of an objective violation test permits gradual executive accumulation.

Tariff authority: When executives claim inherent or broadly-delegated tariff power, citizens bear billions in economic harm while litigation proceeds through years of statutory interpretation. Even successful challenges reach only the statutory question—whether a particular statute authorizes the specific action—not the constitutional question of whether Congress can delegate the tariff power at all. The executive can simply invoke a different statutory basis and begin again.

Spending power: Impoundment disputes follow the same pattern. Executives withhold appropriated funds, litigation ensues, and by the time courts rule, appropriations cycles have moved on. The constitutional assignment of the spending power to Congress is never definitively enforced.

Administrative rulemaking: Agencies promulgate rules with the force of law, regulated parties challenge specific rules, and courts evaluate whether agencies followed proper procedures or acted within statutory bounds. The fundamental question—whether legislative power can be delegated at all—is treated as settled by acquiescence rather than constitutional analysis.

In each domain, the party in power defines its own limits. Constitutional boundaries become negotiating positions rather than enforceable constraints. The more widely shared the constitutional harm, the less likely any court will hear the challenge.

With equitable standing for enumerated constitutional violations operational, this dynamic would change. Courts would address the constitutional assignment directly: Does Article I assign this power to Congress? If so, no statute can transfer it elsewhere. The executive would be required to work with Congress—as constitutionally mandated—rather than claiming inherent or delegated authority that the Constitution does not permit.

The constitutional pathway exists. Article III equity jurisdiction recovers it.

PART X: CONCLUSION

X. CONCLUSION

Madison warned that "a mere demarcation on parchment of the constitutional limits of the several departments, is not a sufficient guard against those encroachments which lead to a tyrannical concentration of all the powers of government in the same hands."[82]

For 239 years, his warning has been prophetic. The constitutional text establishes boundaries, but without an enforcement mechanism, those boundaries have become advisory. The party in power defines its own limits. Constitutional violations are resolved by power rather than law.

This Article provides what Madison knew was necessary: an objective mechanism for identifying when the parchment barriers have been breached.

The Madisonian six-step test is not judicial policy-making. It is textual analysis that any court can apply and any citizen can understand. The test asks structural questions with determinate answers: Does a constitutional clause assign the power? Can a valid syllogism be constructed? Does the interpretive method work for parallel clauses? Is the power structurally non-delegable? Does the claimed actor satisfy all definitional clauses?

The test has been validated against 36 Supreme Court decisions spanning 154 years. It correctly identifies as unconstitutional every action the Court has invalidated. There is no reason to believe it fails for actions the Court has not yet reviewed.

The standing doctrine necessary to enforce the test is not novel but recovered. Before 1923, shared constitutional injuries were sufficient for equity jurisdiction. The 1938 procedural

82 The Federalist No. 48, at 308 (James Madison).

merger collapsed distinct standing doctrines without constitutional analysis. *Lujan*'s particularized injury requirement is correct for statutory claims but should not bar constitutional violation claims, where citizens enforce the People's direct expression of will.

The equation is complete:

Separation of Powers = Non-Delegation = Liberty

Each failed test represents an accumulation of power that Madison defined as tyranny. The test identifies these accumulations. Article III equity jurisdiction provides the enforcement mechanism.

The Constitution can be more than parchment. But only if courts will enforce what Madison wrote.

AFTERWORD: THE HUMAN COST

Throughout American history, citizens have died in military conflicts initiated without constitutional authorization. Each such death raises an unanswerable question: Did this person give their life by the will of the American people, expressed through their constitutional representatives? Or was their sacrifice ordered by an executive acting outside constitutional bounds?

Madison's separation of powers was designed not merely to distribute authority but to distribute *responsibility*. When Congress debates and votes on war, each representative must confront the decision. Each name is recorded. Citizens witness who chose to authorize the commitment of American lives. The constitutional structure forces specific, named individuals to bear the moral weight of that choice.

When the President bypasses Congress, this moral architecture collapses. No representative voted to authorize the conflict. No congressional record documents who said yes. The decision that sends Americans to die was made by one person, insulated from the collective deliberation the Constitution requires.

This is not merely a procedural defect. It is a moral injury to the constitutional fabric. The families of those who die in unauthorized conflicts cannot know whether their loved one's sacrifice was made in service to the constitutional republic or in service to an unconstitutional act. The constitutional violation makes that question unanswerable.

The separation of powers does not merely break a constitutional rule when violated. It severs the connection between decision and consequence. It permits everyone involved to claim they did not choose this outcome—the President claims emergency, Congress claims it was not consulted, and the courts claim the question is not justiciable.

The moral weight falls on no one—except the dead, and those who grieve them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const. pmbl.

U.S. Const. art. I, § 1.

U.S. Const. art. I, § 6, cl. 2.

U.S. Const. art. I, § 7.

U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 1.

U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 11.

U.S. Const. art. II, § 1.

U.S. Const. art. II, § 2.

U.S. Const. art. II, § 3.

U.S. Const. art. III, § 1.

U.S. Const. art. III, § 2.

U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2.

U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 3.

U.S. Const. amend. VII.

U.S. Const. amend. IX.

U.S. Const. amend. X.

U.S. Const. amend. XIV.

Supreme Court Cases

A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 295 U.S. 495 (1935).

Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

Bond v. United States, 564 U.S. 211 (2011).

Bond v. United States, 572 U.S. 844 (2014).

Bowsher v. Synar, 478 U.S. 714 (1986).

Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1 (1976).

Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478 (1978).

Clinton v. City of New York, 524 U.S. 417 (1998).

Collins v. Yellen, 141 S. Ct. 1761 (2021).

Crampton v. Zabriskie, 101 U.S. 601 (1879).

Dunlop v. Bachowski, 421 U.S. 560 (1975).

Fairchild v. Hughes, 258 U.S. 126 (1922).

Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, 561 U.S. 477 (2010).

Frothingham v. Mellon, 262 U.S. 447 (1923).

Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800 (1982).

Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).

INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 919 (1983).

Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump, 607 U.S. ___ (2026).

Lucia v. SEC, 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 (1992).

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).

Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority v. Citizens for the Abatement of Aircraft Noise, Inc., 501 U.S. 252 (1991).

New York v. United States, 505 U.S. 144 (1992).

Nixon v. Administrator of General Services, 433 U.S. 425 (1977).

NLRB v. Noel Canning, 573 U.S. 513 (2014).

Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. 50 (1982).

Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan, 293 U.S. 388 (1935).

Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc., 514 U.S. 211 (1995).

Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898 (1997).

Seila Law LLC v. CFPB, 140 S. Ct. 2183 (2020).

Tennessee Electric Power Co. v. TVA, 306 U.S. 118 (1939).

United States v. Arthrex, Inc., 141 S. Ct. 1970 (2021).

United States v. Klein, 80 U.S. (13 Wall.) 128 (1872).

United States v. Munoz-Flores, 495 U.S. 385 (1990).

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579 (1952).

Zivotofsky v. Kerry, 576 U.S. 1 (2015).

Lower Court Cases

Campbell v. Clinton, 203 F.3d 19 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

Statutes

Insurrection Act of 1807, ch. 39, 2 Stat. 443.

International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1707.

Rules Enabling Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2072.

Trade Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-618, § 122, 88 Stat. 1978 (codified at 19 U.S.C. § 2132).

War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541-1548.

42 U.S.C. § 1983.

18 U.S.C. §§ 6001-6005.

Founding Era Documents

James Madison, *Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments* (1785), *in* 2 The Writings of James Madison 183 (Gaillard Hunt ed., 1901).

James Madison, Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 (Ohio Univ. Press 1984) (1840).

James Madison, Report of 1800 (Jan. 7, 1800), *reprinted in* 4 Elliot's Debates 546 (2d ed. 1891).

James Madison, Report on the Virginia Resolutions (1800), *reprinted in* 4 Elliot's Debates 546 (2d ed. 1891).

James Madison to Albert Gallatin (Aug. 1806), *in* 7 The Writings of James Madison (Gaillard Hunt ed., 1908).

The Federalist No. 47 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961).

The Federalist No. 48 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961).

The Federalist No. 49 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961).

The Federalist No. 51 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961).

Virginia Ratification Declaration (June 26, 1788), *reprinted in* 3 Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution 656 (Jonathan Elliot ed., 2d ed. 1891).

Books and Treatises

Louis Fisher, Presidential War Power (2d ed. 2004).

News Sources

Charlie Savage, *Barack Obama's Q&A Session on Libya and War Powers*, N.Y. Times, June 15, 2011, at A1.

[END OF DRAFT]

Word Count: Approximately 24,500 words (Parts I-X plus Bibliography)

Status: Core argument complete with historical focus suitable for anonymous submission

Citation Format: Bluebook (21st ed.)