

# Detaining Arizona

---

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

This is an opinion item.

**Author(s)** National Review editorial board

**Source** National Review

**Date** July 29, 2010

**URL** <http://article.nationalreview.com/438844/detaining-arizona/the-editors>

**Quote**

“ “An increase in the number of requests for determinations of immigration,” she writes, “will divert resources from the federal government’s other responsibilities and priorities.” Earlier in her decision, Judge Bolton sets out the different kinds of preemption, e.g. field preemption (where federal regulation is so comprehensive it “occupies the field”) and conflict preemption (where a state law is at odds with a federal law). This is something utterly different: “We can’t be bothered to answer the phone” preemption.” ”

Add or change this opinion item's references

This item argues against the position Judge Bolton's ruling was justified on the topic United States of America v. Arizona.

---

Retrieved from "[https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Detaining\\_Arizona&oldid=12533](https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Detaining_Arizona&oldid=12533)"

---

**This page was last edited on July 29, 2010, at 22:29.**

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.