

Direct Conflict

A state law, which requires an action which conflicts with an action prohibited by federal statute, violates the Supremacy Clause. Same thing goes for a law which requires one to refrain from acting, when federal law requires action. For example, if the state of Nebraska revoked the driver's license of all citizens who filed federal income tax returns, that law would violate the Supremacy Clause and be held to be void.

(E). None of the Above.

There are a few things that the Constitution explicitly lists as the way things absolutely must be, and nobody can change them, short of amending the Constitution. As an example: the Constitution requires that a person must be at least thirty-five years of age to become the President of the United States. Congress cannot mess with this in any way. A state cannot mess with it either. If Kansas passed a law which said, "No candidate for President of the United States may appear on the ballot in this state if that candidate is not thirty-five years old at the time they file their candidacy," that law would violate the Constitution's Supremacy Clause as well. The Constitution sets any and all standards for the Presidency, Senate and House of representatives, and no state is allowed to interfere. This is why states cannot set term limits for their members of Congress.

"Respect My Authority!"

So, what if Bobby of Virginia sues Tony of Virginia for negligence and wins a big judgment against Tony? Tony of Virginia then becomes Tony of Rhode Island in order to get out of it. Do the courts of Rhode Island have to honor the judgment of Virginia's courts, even if Rhode Island's rules of negligence are different from those of Virginia's?

YES! The Constitution, Article IV, Section 1, has a funky little clause in it (which is in fact a sentence and not a clause), called the "Full Faith and Credit Clause". It is perplexing on its face ...and for more reason than being a misnomer. The "clause" reads,