

The Burger Court Opinion Writing Database

Board of Regents of the University of Texas System v. New Left Education Project

404 U.S. 541 (1972)

Paul J. Wahlbeck, George Washington University

James F. Spriggs, II, Washington University

Forrest Maltzman, George Washington University



Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

January 21, 1972

Re: No. 70-55 - Board of Regents of the University
of Texas System v. New Left Education Project

Dear Byron:

Please join me.

Regards,

WEB

Mr. Justice White

cc: The Conference

2nd DRAFT

To: THE Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 70-55

Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, Appellant,
v.
New Left Education Project et al.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

[January —, 1972]

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS, dissenting.

When I authored *Moody v. Flowers*, 387 U. S. 97, I thought I was writing a chapter on federalism within a State. Cities, counties, and the State as a whole constitute that federalism. The three-judge court statute, 28 U. S. C. § 2281, speaks of "the enforcement, operation or execution of any State statute." A city ordinance or a county regulation does not meet that requirement and so the county regulations involved in *Moody* did not satisfy the statute though authorized by the State. If the source of the authority is state action, the statute is presumably satisfied, since normally, of course, state laws have an impact on activities in every city and every county. But where a state law is not of "statewide concern" but involves only "legislation affecting a locality" (*Rouck v. Commissioners*, 307 U. S. 208, 213), then the policy of 28 U. S. C. § 2281 is deemed not served.

But a State's university system, involving, as does this one, 17 institutions, is plainly of "state-wide concern" even though not every county has a university. The matter involves more than state "legislation affecting a

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

3rd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES Douglas, J.

No. 70-55

Circulated: _____

Recirculated: 1-13

Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, Appellant,
v.
New Left Education Project et al.

On Appeal from the
United States District
Court for the Western
District of Texas.

[January —, 1972]

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS, dissenting.

When I authored *Moody v. Flowers*, 387 U. S. 97, I thought I was writing a chapter on federalism within a State. Cities, counties, and the State as a whole constitute that federalism. The three-judge court statute, 28 U. S. C. § 2281, speaks of "the enforcement, operation or execution of any State statute." A city ordinance or a county regulation does not meet that requirement and so the county regulations involved in *Moody* did not satisfy the statute though authorized by the State. If the source of the authority is state action, the statute is presumably satisfied, since normally, of course, state laws have an impact on activities in every city and every county. But where a state law is not of "statewide concern" but involves only "legislation affecting a locality" (*Rouck v. Commissioners*, 307 U. S. 208, 213), then the policy of 28 U. S. C. § 2281 is deemed not served.

But a State's university system, involving, as does this one, 17 institutions, is plainly of "state-wide concern" even though not every county has a university.¹ The

¹ During oral argument, counsel for appellants indicated that their authority extended over some "17 component institutions in the system," stretching from El Paso on the far western tip of the State.

For: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

4th DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Justice Douglas, J.

No. 70-55

Circulated:

Recirculated:

Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, Appellant,
v.
New Left Education Project et al.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

[January —, 1972]

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS, dissenting.

When I authored *Moody v. Flowers*, 387 U. S. 97, I thought I was writing a chapter on federalism within a State. Cities, counties, and the State as a whole constitute that federalism. The three-judge court statute, 28 U. S. C. § 2281, speaks of "the enforcement, operation or execution of any State statute." A city ordinance or a county regulation does not meet that requirement and so the county regulations involved in *Moody* did not satisfy the statute though enacted by the State. If the source of the authority is state action, the statute is presumably satisfied, since normally, of course, state laws have an impact on activities in every city and every county. But where a state law is not of "statewide concern" but involves only "legislation affecting a locality" (*Rorick v. Commissioners*, 307 U. S. 208, 213), then the policy of 28 U. S. C. § 2281 is deemed not served.

But a State's university system, involving, as does this one, 17 institutions, is plainly of "state-wide concern" even though not every county has a university.¹ The

¹ During oral argument, counsel for appellant indicated that its authority extended over some "17 component institutions in the system," stretching from El Paso on the far western tip of the State.

3
2 1
fair joined BKR

5th DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 70-55

Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, Appellant,
v.
New Left Education Project et al. } On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

glas. J.

1/20/72 ✓

[January —, 1972]

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS, dissenting.

When I authored *Moody v. Flowers*, 387 U. S. 97, I thought I was writing a chapter on federalism within a State. Cities, counties, and the State as a whole constitute that federalism. The three-judge court statute, 28 U. S. C. § 2281, speaks of "the enforcement, operation or execution of any State statute." A city ordinance or a county regulation does not meet that requirement and so the county regulations involved in *Moody* did not satisfy the statute though enacted by the State. If the source of the authority is state action, the statute is presumably satisfied, since normally, of course, state laws have an impact on activities in every city and every county. But where a state law is not of "statewide concern" but involves only "legislation affecting a locality" (*Rorick v. Commissioners*, 307 U. S. 208, 213), then the policy of 28 U. S. C. § 2281 is deemed not served.

But a State's university system, involving, as does this one, 17 institutions, is plainly of "state-wide concern" even though not every county has a university.¹

¹ During oral argument, counsel for appellant indicated that its authority extended over some "17 component institutions in the system," stretching from El Paso on the far western tip of the State,

6th DRAFT

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall ✓
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 70-55

Printed in U.S.A.

Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, Appellant,
v.
New Left Education Project et al. 1/21/72 ✓

On Appeal from the
United States District
Court for the Western
District of Texas.

[January 24, 1972]

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS, dissenting.

When I authored *Moody v. Flowers*, 387 U. S. 97, I thought I was writing a chapter on federalism within a State. Cities, counties, and the State as a whole constitute that federalism. The three-judge court statute, 28 U. S. C. § 2281, speaks of "the enforcement, operation or execution of any State statute." A city ordinance or a county regulation does not meet that requirement and so the county regulations involved in *Moody* did not satisfy the statute though enacted by the State. If the source of the authority is state action, the statute is presumably satisfied, since normally, of course, state laws have an impact on activities in every city and every county. But where a state law is not of "statewide concern" but involves only "legislation affecting a locality" (*Rorick v. Commissioners*, 307 U. S. 208, 213), then the policy of 28 U. S. C. § 2281 is deemed not served.

But a State's university system, involving, as does this one, 17 institutions, is plainly of "state-wide concern" even though not every county has a university.¹

¹ During oral argument, counsel for appellant indicated that its authority extended over some "17 component institutions in the system," stretching from El Paso on the far western tip of the State,

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WM. J. BRENNAN, JR.

January 11, 1972

RE: No. 70-55 - Board of Regents of the
University of Texas System v. New
Left Education Project, et al.

Dear Byron:

I agree.

Sincerely,

fwj

Mr. Justice White

cc: The Conference

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE POTTER STEWART

January 11, 1972

70-55, Board of Regents v.
New Left Education Project

Dear Byron,

I am glad to join your opinion for the
Court in this case.

Sincerely yours,

P.S.

Mr. Justice White

Copies to the Conference

6
Plaint for me

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
 Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

From: White, J.

Circulated: 1-11-72

Recirculated: _____

1st DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 70-55

Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, Appellant,
v.
New Left Education Project et al. } On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

[January —, 1972]

MR. JUSTICE WHITE delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case comes here on direct appeal from the ruling of a three-judge court declaring unconstitutional and enjoining enforcement of two sections of the Rules and Regulations of appellant Board of Regents of the University of Texas System. A-69-CA-106 (WD Texas, Sept. 9, 1970). We postponed consideration of our jurisdiction to a hearing on the merits. 401 U. S. 935 (1971). For reasons explained below, we have concluded that we lack jurisdiction of this appeal.

This litigation began when the Board of Regents sued the New Left Educational Project and certain individuals in a Texas court. In that suit, the Regents sought to restrain defendants from distributing a newspaper and making either commercial or noncommercial solicitations on the Austin campus of the University of Texas except in compliance with appellant's rules. Defendants countered by bringing this federal suit to enjoin further state court proceedings on the ground that the rules which the Regents sought to enforce abridged defendants' First Amendment rights. A three-judge court met and de-

80
You joined
You left 5/4
8/5/72

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
 Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

From: White, J.

2nd DRAFT

Circulated: _____

Recirculated: 1-18-72

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 70-55

Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, Appellant, v. New Left Education Project et al. } On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

[January —, 1972]

MR. JUSTICE WHITE delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case comes here on direct appeal from the ruling of a three-judge court declaring unconstitutional and enjoining enforcement of two sections of the Rules and Regulations of appellant Board of Regents of the University of Texas System. A-69-CA-106 (WD Texas, Sept. 9, 1970). We postponed consideration of our jurisdiction to a hearing on the merits. 401 U. S. 935 (1971). For reasons explained below, we have concluded that we lack jurisdiction of this appeal.

This litigation began when the Board of Regents sued the New Left Educational Project and certain individuals in a Texas court. In that suit, the Regents sought to restrain defendants from distributing a newspaper and making either commercial or noncommercial solicitations on the Austin campus of the University of Texas except in compliance with appellant's rules. Defendants countered by bringing this federal suit to enjoin further state court proceedings on the ground that the rules which the Regents sought to enforce abridged defendants' First

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE THURGOOD MARSHALL

January 18, 1972

Re: No. 70-55 - Board of Regents v. New Left Education

Dear Byron:

Please join me.

Sincerely,


T.M.

Mr. Justice White

cc: The Conference

50
Supreme Court of the United States

Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE HARRY A. BLACKMUN

January 13, 1972

Re: No. 70-55 - Board of Regents v. New Left
Education Project

Dear Byron:

I agree.

Sincerely,

Ha A.

Mr. Justice White

cc: The Conference