In today’s society, the term equality is used in many different ways; from an argument between two people to an important factor in the United States Courts. Many individuals are questioning if single-sex institutions are either equal or unequal. People believe that the 5th and 14th Amendments can be applicable universally and be used against single-sex institutions. People who believe single-sex education is unequal consider single-sex institutions to be promoting sexism and separating both genders. Whereas, people who are for single-sex education believe that having single-sex schools are beneficial to students by creating a safe and comfortable learning environment to fixing the gender gap in STEM fields. Mr. Adam Connolly has commenced a case that is similar to the inequality that single-sex institutions pose. After a thorough examination of the 5th and 14th Amendments, *amicus curiae* briefs, and multiple precedents, the First Year Associates and I have come to terms to not take the case.

The first and most imperative reason for not taking this case is that Mr. Connolly’s testimony of discrimination from single-sex education is not valid. Mr. Adam Connolly believes that single-sex education is an opposition of the 5th and 14th Amendments. The 5th and 14th Amendments state that “no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law,” but the only way for both amendments to be used against single-sex education is if there was real discrimination. Discrimination is the practice of classifying or treating groups of people differently or with harsh treatment; single-sex schools are not made to make the one sex feel inferior to the opposite sex. The 5th Amendment prohibits the federal government from discriminating on a group of people without due process of law. As well as the 5th Amendment, the 14th Amendment prevents state governments from discriminating towards the people of the United States. The Constitution prohibits discrimination that is considered unreasonable; meaning if the discrimination does not have any purpose behind it, then it is considered going against the Constitution.

Discrimination is allowed in some specific cases and if rational basis is applied, the courts will allow the discrimination. Mr. Connolly is suing because his son is allegedly being discriminated because of his gender, and if this case goes to the courts, they may partake in the heightened or intermediate scrutiny test. This test determines whether or not there was discrimination based on gender in place, but since Mr. Conolly does not show enough persuasive justification, the court may find the single-sex schools are fair. Mr. Connolly’s son identifies as a male and wishes to attend an all girl’s school, the court may think that his son applying to the all girl’s school was unreasonable and disrupts the school’s objective. Thus, the use of the 5th and 14th Amendments against single-sex institutions is not valid to be used in this situation.

The second reason why we are not taking this case is because if Mr. Connolly's son were to attend the all girl’s school it would disrupt the mission and learning environment of that respective school. In Erica Karros’ *amicus curiae* brief, she states that “single-sex schools serve a unique purpose by allowing families to voluntarily place themselves into environments where they can thrive while making up the gap in math and science.” The Young Women’s Leadership Network wants to minimize the gap in math and science fields and letting Connolly’s son join would not allow this mission to thrive. Also in Karros’ *amicus curiae* brief, she states that “the mere presence of young men has effects that many are not aware of.” If Mr. Connolly’s son were to attend this school, the young women would not benefit from his presence but rather be affected by it. The young women will have to revert back to traditional environments where the roles and education of urban young women are lower than desirable. If a young male is admitted to the single sex school, teachers would expect more from males, because they are viewed as more dominant in math and science. Admitting Mr. Connolly’s son into this single-sex institution, would distort all the special aspects and missions of the school, making it difficult for the girls to continue to thrive.

The final reason why we should not take this case is because Mr. Connolly fails to show that single-sex school constitute gender discrimination. In a similar precedent to this case, *Vorchheimer v. School District of Philadelphia* (1977), the court did not agree with the plaintiff because single-sex schools are legally allowed. The court decided that Susan Vorchheimer could not attend an all boy’s school. The court did not allow Vorchheimer to attend the all boy’s school because “the (14th) Amendment [is] undoubtedly to enforce the . . . equality of the two (sexes) before the law, but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon (sex)...” The 14th Amendment is to enforce equality between sexes, but it is not used to abolish distinctions between them. For Mr. Connolly’s case, he is also using the 14th Amendment to get rid of the distinction between them; so if this were to go to the court,  the court may not allow Connolly’s son to attend the all girl’s school. Also the precedent states that “laws permitting, and even requiring, separation in places where they are liable to be brought into contact with each other do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either (sex) to the other.” Even if sexes are separated in schools, it does not make either sex inferior to the other. The precedent also states that single-sex schools have been a valid exercise of the legislative power by the courts where political rights of women have been enforced. Therefore, if we take this case, the court may not let Mr. Connolly's son to attend the all girl’s school because having single-sex schools are allowed.

After much analyzation of all factors to this case, we are very pleased with our decision of not taking Mr. Connolly’s case. The 5th and 14th Amendments cannot be used against single-sex schools because the gender discrimination in single-sex schools is necessary, because the intention of these schools are to provide students with a comfortable learning environment and to help students thrive. Therefore, the 5th and 14th Amendments are not valid for Mr. Connolly's argument. Erica Karros’ *amicus curiae* brief, from the Young Women’s Leadership Network, clearly states that single-sex education is not discriminating and going against the opposite sex, but rather helping a specific sex defeat the gap in math and science fields. If single-sex schools end, the gap in STEM fields would not decrease but rather get worse. The YWLN helps young women build their confidence and skills, not to go against males. Lastly, the *Vorchheimer v. School District of Philadelphia* precedent clearly represents that single-sex schools are valid and do not make one sex inferior to the other. All in all, the First Associates and I are very confident in the decision we made, and we hope you believe that this is the best decision for us.