Indiana Law Journal

Volume 89 | Issue 1 Article 1

Winter 2014

Introduction: Invited Essays on the Implications of Windsor and Perry

Introduction:

Invited Essays on the Implications of *Windsor* and *Perry*

The *Indiana Law Journal* is pleased to present the following essays regarding the Supreme Court's decisions in two same-sex marriage cases from the 2012–2013 Term. The Court's decisions in *United States v. Windsor*[1] and *Hollingsworth v. Perry*[2] have rightfully received a great deal of attention since their announcement in the summer of 2013 and will undoubtedly continue to be a source of discussion, research, and analysis as the broad-reaching effects are felt in the law and society at large.

Given the historic nature of these cases, and the uncertainty over the implications that the decisions will have for numerous legal doctrines, the Editors of the *Indiana Law Journal* solicited essays from Professors Dawn Johnsen,[3] Daniel Conkle,[4] Deborah Widiss,[5] Ryan Scott,[6] and Steve Sanders.[7] These essays each focus on a particular aspect of the Court's decisions in *Windsor* and *Perry*, and taken together they provide a broad and nuanced analysis of the implications of these cases. The topics of the individual essays are loosely based on an April 2, 2013 panel discussion in which the authors participated at Indiana University Maurer School of Law.

The essays included in this Issue go beyond an analysis of the cases themselves, providing commentary, predictions, and recommendations regarding the place of *Windsor* and *Perry* in broader legal doctrine and in American life. The diverse issues addressed include the ramifications of the decisions for specific legal doctrines, such as Article III intervenor standing to appeal and the meaning of the Full Faith and Credit Clause, how the federal government should respond to uncertainties in the new legal framework around "marriage," and broader concepts of constitutional interpretation, such as the role that evolving social understandings should play in interpretation, in contrast to a narrow originalist approach.

It is our hope that these essays, both individually and taken together, offer an important early contribution to the discussion of these issues. The Editors of the *Indiana Law Journal* would like to thank the authors for the generous contribution of their time and talents to this effort.

---

1. 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013).
2. 133 S. Ct. 2652 (2013).
3. Dawn Johnsen, Windsor*,* Shelby County*, and the Demise of Originalism: A Personal Account*, 89 IND. L.J. 3 (2014).
4. Daniel O. Conkle, *Evolving Values, Animus, and Same-Sex Marriage*, 89 IND. L.J. 27 (2014).
5. Deborah A. Widiss, *Leveling Up After DOMA*, 89 IND. L.J. 43 (2014).
6. Ryan W. Scott, *Standing to Appeal and Executive Non-Defense of Federal Law After the Marriage Cases*, 89 IND. L.J. 67 (2014).
7. Steve Sanders, *Is the Full Faith and Credit Clause Still "Irrelevant" to Same-Sex Marriage?: Toward a Reconsideration of Conventional Wisdom*, 89 IND. L.J. 95 (2014).