

September 1, 2005

The Honorable Arlen Specter
Chairman
United States Senate Judiciary Committee
711 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Patrick Leahy
Ranking Member
United States Senate Judiciary Committee
433 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senators Specter and Leahy,

As law professors from across the United States, we write to express our opposition to the confirmation of Judge John Roberts to the United States Supreme Court.

The record made available to date suggests that Judge Roberts holds a limited view of Congress' authority to enact key worker, civil rights and environmental protections and a similarly narrow view of the vital role our courts and our government play in safeguarding individual rights, especially civil and women's rights. In contrast, Judge Roberts holds an expansive view of presidential power and law enforcement authority. If transformed into decisional law, these views, taken together, could produce a government with little power to protect its citizenry and a citizenry with greatly reduced power to protect itself from the abuses of government and other powerful interests. In other words, they could produce a national order contrary to the promises of our Constitution and the rights it guarantees.

Congress' authority to correct nationwide problems. In his very first opinion on the bench, Judge Roberts dissented to express an exceedingly restrictive view of Congress' authority to enact important regulatory legislation. He suggested that Congress did not have the power, under the Constitution's Commerce Clause, to protect what he called a "hapless toad" through endangered species laws. No court has ever declared an application of the Endangered Species Act unconstitutional. Judge Roberts' apparent view of Congress' authority potentially threatens a wide swath of legislation rooted in the Commerce Clause, including civil rights safeguards, minimum wage and maximum hour laws, clean air, clean water, and workplace safety protections.

Judicial authority to protect individual rights. During his years of service in the administrations of Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush, under the banner of so-called "judicial restraint," Judge Roberts helped push legal policies that sought to weaken the vital, historic role of the federal courts as an enforcer of individual rights, including, prominently, the rights of racial minorities and women.

Judge Roberts has shown a lack of appreciation for the importance of remedying this country's shameful legacy of racial discrimination. Less than twenty years after the enactment of the Voting Rights Act, he opposed reinvigorating Section 2 following the Supreme Court's decision

in *Mobile v. Bolden*, characterizing the revision as a “radical experiment.”¹ Judge Roberts argued that “violations of § 2 should not be made too easy to prove” since doing so would “provide a basis for the most intrusive interference imaginable by federal courts into state and local processes.”² Fortunately, Congress overwhelmingly rejected Judge Roberts’ position, leading to increased minority representation in state and local governments. Judge Roberts also defended the constitutionality of legislation stripping the Supreme Court of its ability to hear desegregation cases and legislation stripping the lower federal courts of their authority to remedy school desegregation with busing. In addition, he condemned a key Supreme Court decision striking down a Texas law allowing schools to deny admission to the children of undocumented aliens; called the Fair Housing Act “government intrusion”; advised the Justice Department not to seek standard remedies in job discrimination cases – offers of employment and backpay – calling them “staggering”; criticized a long-standing executive order requiring federal contractors to set flexible, reasonable goals and timetables, not “quotas,” for hiring more minorities to correct unlawful workplace disparities; asserted that an affirmative action program failed because it “required the recruiting of inadequately prepared candidates”; and as Acting Solicitor General, with final decision-making authority over the government’s position, sought to invalidate the Federal Communication Commission’s affirmative action program in broadcast licensing, an extremely rare move given that the Solicitor General’s Office, pursuant to its statutory mandate, almost always defends federal government policy.

Judge Roberts has similarly taken positions that would undermine women’s rights, particularly in the areas of sex discrimination and reproductive choice. While in the Reagan Justice Department, he advocated several positions that would have limited the effectiveness and scope of Title IX, the law barring discrimination against women in education. He also asserted a cost defense to gender discrimination and argued that the Constitution’s equal protection clause should not give heightened constitutional protection to women facing government-sponsored sex discrimination – positions the Supreme Court had rejected. As associate White Counsel in the Reagan White House, Judge Roberts derided bipartisan state and national efforts to fix what he referred to as the “purported gender gap”³ in job pay, confidently dismissing men’s pay advantage over women as attributable to factors like seniority and women leaving the workforce for family reasons. Later, as deputy Solicitor General, he co-authored a brief arguing that Title IX did not permit a girl who was repeatedly sexually harassed by her teacher to sue for compensatory damages, an argument the Supreme Court rejected, in part for leaving the girl “no remedy at all.”

Judge Roberts’ record on reproductive choice is also of great concern. In a brief and on public television, he argued, as principal deputy Solicitor General, that a civil rights law did not protect women from harassment by violent anti-abortion demonstrators at abortion clinics. He also wrote in a government brief that *Roe v. Wade* “was wrongly decided and should be overruled.”

¹ Memorandum from John Roberts to The Attorney General, Edward Schmultz, W. Bradford Reynolds, Stan Morris, Bruce Fein, Kenneth Starr, Thomas DeCair, and Tex Lezar re: “Response to Vernon Jordon on the Voting Rights Act”, attaching draft article, (Nov. 17, 1981) (on file with Alliance for Justice).

² Memorandum from John Roberts to The Attorney General re: “Voting Rights Act: Section 2”, attaching a statement entitled “Why Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act Should Be Retained Unchanged” (Dec. 22, 1981) (on file with Alliance for Justice).

³ Memorandum from John G. Roberts to Fred F. Fielding re: Draft “Status of the States” 1982 Year End Report (Jan. 17, 1983) (on file with Alliance for Justice).

Judge Roberts has taken similarly regressive positions on a host of other federal rights and protections. While in the Reagan Justice Department, he dismissed what he referred to as the “so-called right to privacy” and generally objected to the notion of “fundamental rights,” with specific criticism of *Griswold v. Connecticut*. He also referred to litigation under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a landmark law, as the “most serious federal court problem” and decried “the damage” wrought by the Supreme Court’s holding that federal statutory rights were enforceable under Section 1983. As principal deputy Solicitor General, without invitation from the Supreme Court, he weighed in on two cases seeking to restrict Section 1983’s scope, asserting in one that federal courts had no authority to enforce federal Medicaid law and, in the other, that they could not enforce the federal law requiring state child welfare agencies receiving federal funds to make reasonable efforts to keep or reunite foster children with their natural families. Judge Roberts also defended the George H.W. Bush administration’s position that private citizens have limited rights to enforce environmental protections, even where Congress tries to provide them broader enforcement authority.

Expanding Executive Authority. On the bench and in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations, Judge Roberts has accorded great deference to the authority of both the president and law enforcement. As to presidential power, he joined a D.C. Circuit decision adopting the Bush administration’s position that detainees designated as “enemy combatants” may be tried for war crimes before military commissions lacking basic procedural safeguards, ruling that the Geneva Convention, which provides trial protections to prisoners of war, is unenforceable in U.S. courts and, alternatively, did not apply to the detainees. In addition, disagreeing with the other judges on a three-judge panel, Judge Roberts adopted the Bush administration’s position that a presidential order validly eliminated lawsuits against Iraqi officials brought by American POWs for torture they suffered during the first Gulf War. During his service in the Reagan administration, Judge Roberts vigorously defended the unfettered exercise of presidential power. Among other things, he embraced the rather extreme libertarian fantasy of reconsidering the constitutionality of and abolishing independent regulatory agencies – like the Federal Reserve Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the Consumer Products Safety Commission and the Occupational Safety and Health Commission – on the theory that they usurp powers reserved for the president.

Judge Roberts’ overly deferential view of law enforcement authority is also noteworthy. On the bench, he has rejected several significant claims of improper search and seizure, dissenting in one case where the majority reversed the conviction, breaking from precedent in another to justify the search, and denying relief in a third to a 12-year-old girl who was arrested and detained for eating a french fry on the subway, even though an adult caught doing the same thing would have been given a citation. This limited judicial record is a natural extension of what Judge Roberts advocated in the Reagan and first Bush administrations. As the principal deputy Solicitor General, according to the *Wall Street Journal*, “his office chose to get involved in dozens of state cases to limit the rights of criminal defendants.”⁴ For instance, the office sought to erect new procedural hurdles to federal *habeas corpus* review of state convictions and to bar certain kinds of *habeas* claims from being heard, including alleged *Miranda* violations and claims of actual innocence. As an advisor in the Reagan administration, Judge Roberts

⁴ Jess Bravin, *Judge Roberts’s Rules of Law and Order*, WALL STREET JOURNAL, Aug. 8, 2005 at A4.

advocated overriding the strong ethical and legal prohibitions on law enforcement officials directly communicating with criminal defendants known to be represented by counsel, limiting *habeas* relief, and curtailing the rule that requires exclusion of evidence obtained in violation of the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures.

Expanding the role of religion in public institutions. In the Reagan administration, Judge Roberts approved a speech by Education Secretary Bill Bennett criticizing Supreme Court decisions barring religion in schools as antithetical to “the preservation of a free society”; defended the constitutionality of legislation stripping the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear school prayer cases; and called a Supreme Court decision invalidating a religiously-inspired moment of silence “indefensible.” Judge Roberts applauded then-Associate Justice Rehnquist’s dissent for seeking to overturn a landmark precedent – “the *Lemon* test” – which ensures government neutrality toward religion. As principal deputy Solicitor General, Judge Roberts joined efforts to do what he had tacitly praised Justice Rehnquist for attempting: Judge Roberts co-authored briefs asking the Court to scrap the *Lemon* test and uphold a school district’s practice of paying clergy to deliver religious prayers at graduation ceremonies. The Supreme Court struck down the practice as impermissibly advancing religion.

*

*

*

Judge Roberts is a gifted lawyer with impressive professional qualifications. His existing record, however, demonstrates that he does not appreciate the important role that an independent judiciary plays in safeguarding individual rights and enforcing legal protections. Perhaps additional portions of his record, withheld by the current administration, would tell us something different. Judge Roberts’ 1989-1993 service as principal deputy Solicitor General warrants close examination. The position of second-in-charge of the Solicitor General’s Office was the most important, most influential position Judge Roberts held as a lawyer. And because the position gave him the opportunity to express his legal views on the most important issues facing the nation – voting rights, school desegregation, sex discrimination, access to justice, affirmative action, church-state separation, criminal justice – the limited set of documents sought by Judiciary Committee Democrats could potentially provide the best insight into how he would approach the law if confirmed. The White House’s refusal to disclose these documents, however, leaves the Senate and the American people with the record set forth above.

Because Judge Roberts, if confirmed, will replace retiring Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, his views on the law are doubly significant. The current court is closely divided. Justice O’Connor has provided the swing vote in many landmark 5-4 decisions. If Judge Roberts steps into her shoes, he will wield enormous power to shape or reshape the law in many of the areas touched on above, including access to the courts, Congress’ legislative authority, civil rights, women’s rights, privacy rights and worker and environmental protections. Based on the existing record, it is evident that as Justice O’Connor’s replacement, Judge Roberts would move the Court away from preserving these vital safeguards.

On the existing record, we do not believe that Judge Roberts warrants a lifetime seat on our nation’s highest court, and we urge the Senate to withhold its consent to his confirmation.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Abel
Connell Professor of Law
University of California—Los Angeles

John Anderson
Visiting Professor of Law
Nova Southeastern University, Shepard Broad Law
Center

Claudia Angelos
Professor of Clinical Law
New York University School of Law

Elvia R. Arriola
Associate Professor of Law
Northern Illinois University

Frank Askin
Professor of Law
Rutgers School of Law

Michael Avery
Professor of Law
Suffolk Law School

Milner S. Ball
Caldwell Professor of Constitutional Law
University of Georgia School of Law

Mark Barenburg
Professor of Law
Columbia Law School

Elizabeth Bartholet
Morris Wasserstein Public Interest Professor of Law
Harvard Law School

Linda M. Beale
Richard W. and Marie L. Corman Scholar and
Associate Professor
University of Illinois College of Law

George Bell
Associate Clinical Professor of Law
University of Illinois College of Law

Jeannine Bell
Professor of Law
Indiana University School of Law—Bloomington

Leslie Bender
Board of Advisors Professor of Law
Syracuse University College of Law

Robert Benson
Professor of Law
Loyola Law School

Adele Bernhard
Associate Professor of Law, Director of Pace
Criminal Justice Clinic & Post-Conviction Project
Pace Law School

Tamar Birckhead
Clinical Assistant Professor of Law
University of North Carolina School of Law

Walter J. Blakey
Professor of Law
University of North Carolina School of Law

Beryl Blaustone
Professor of Law
CUNY Law School

Robert M. Bloom
Professor of Law
Boston College Law School

Michael C. Blumm
Professor of Law
Lewis and Clark Law School

Charles S. Bobis
Professor of Law
St. John's University School of Law

Ivan E. Bodensteiner
Professor of Law
Valparaiso University School of Law

John Charles Boger
Wade Edwards Distinguished Professor of Law
University of North Carolina School of Law

Amelia Boss
Professor of Law
Temple University, Beasley School of Law

Paul Brietzke
Professor of Law
Valparaiso University School of Law

Katherine S. Broderick
Dean and Professor of Law
University of the District of Columbia, Clarke School
of Law

Mark S. Brodin
Professor of Law
Boston College Law School

Richard O. Brooks
Professor of Law
Vermont Law School

Elizabeth M. Bruch
Associate Professor of Law
Valparaiso University School of Law

Susan Bryant
Professor of Law
CUNY Law School

Neil H. Buchanan
Professor of Law
Rutgers School of Law—Newark

Rosanna Cavallaro
Professor of Law
Suffolk University Law School

Erwin Chemerinsky
Alston & Bird Professor of Law and Political Science
Duke University

William Childs
Assistant Professor of Law
Western New England College of Law

Margaret Chon
Professor and Dean's Distinguished Scholar
Seattle University School of Law

Marjorie Cohn
Professor of Law
Thomas Jefferson School of Law

Douglas Colbert
Professor of Law
University of Maryland School of Law

Luke Cole
Visiting Professor of Law
University of California--Hastings, College of Law

John Copacino
Professor of Law
Georgetown University Law Center

Lois Cox
Clinical Professor of Law
University of Iowa College of Law

Rev. Lynne E. Cunningham
Professor of Clinical Law, Emeritus
George Washington University Law School

Charles E. Daye
Henry P. Brandeis Distinguished Professor of Law
University of North Carolina School of Law

Connie de la Vega
Professor of Law
University of San Francisco School of Law

Frank Deale
Associate Professor of Law
CUNY Law School

Diane Dimond
Clinical Professor of Law
Duke University School of Law

Robert Dinerstein
Professor of Law
American University-Washington College of Law

Victoria J. Dodd
Professor of Law
Suffolk University Law School

Jay Dougherty
Professor of Law
Loyola Law School

Pamela Edwards
Professor of Law
CUNY Law School

Maxine Eichner
Associate Professor of Law
University of North Carolina School of Law

Jon Eisenberg
Professor of Law
University of California--Hastings, College of Law

Peter Erlinder
Professor of Law
William Mitchell College of Law

Marie A. Failing
Professor of Law
Hamline University School of Law

Mary Louise Fellows
Everett Fraser
University of Minnesota Law School

Catherine Fisk
Professor of Law
Duke University School of Law

Judy Fonda
Clinical Professor of Law
Loyola Law School

Craig Futterman
Associate Clinical Professor of Law
University of Chicago Law School

Paul J. Galanti
Professor of Law Emeritus
Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis

Mary Ellen Gale
Professor of Law
Whittier Law School

Paula Galowitz
Clinical Professor of Law
New York University School of Law

Alex Geisinger
Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Faculty
Development
Valparaiso University School of Law

Steven G. Gey
David and Deborah Fonvielle and Donald and Janet
Hinkle Professor of Law
Florida State University College of Law

Phyllis Goldfarb
Professor of Law
Boston College Law School

Alvin L. Goldman
Professor of Law
University of Kentucky College of Law

Anne B. Goldstein
Professor of Law
Western New England College of Law

Victor Goode
Associate Professor of Law
CUNY Law School

Robert W. Gordon
Chancellor Kent Professor of Law and Legal History
Yale Law School

Stephen E. Gottlieb
Professor of Law
Albany Law School

Steven K. Green
Associate Professor of Law
Willamette University School of Law

K.J. Greene
Associate Professor of Law
Thomas Jefferson School of Law

Isabelle R. Gunning
Professor of Law
Southwest University School of Law

Phoebe A. Haddon
Professor of Law
Temple University, Beasley School of Law

Linda Hamilton Krieger
Professor of Law
University of California--Berkeley, Boalt Hall School
of Law

Joel Handler
Professor of Law
University of California--Los Angeles Law School

Ian F. Haney Lopez
Professor of Law
University of California--Berkeley, Boalt Hall School
of Law

Sidney L. Haring
Professor of Law
CUNY Law School

Kathy Hessler
Professor of Law
Case Western Reserve School of Law

Steven J. Heyman
Professor of Law
Chicago-Kent College of Law

John Quentin Heywood
Professor of Law
American University-Washington College of Law

Ingrid Hillinger
Professor of Law
Boston College Law School

Wythe Holt
Emeritus University Research Professor of Law
University of Alabama Law School

Ruth-Arlene Howe
Professor of Law
Boston College Law School

Kent Hull
Adjunct Associate Professor of Law
Notre Dame Law School

Richard E. Humphrey
Indiana University School of Law

Tim Iglesias
Associate Professor
University of San Francisco School of Law

Rachel M. Janutis
Associate Professor of Law
Capital University Law School

Peter Jaszi
Professor of Law
American University-Washington College of Law

David Kairys
James E. Beasley Professor of Law
Temple University, Beasley School of Law

Eileen Kaufman
Professor of Law
Touro Law Center

Kevin B. Kelly
Professor of Law
Seton Hall Law School

Joseph E. Kennedy
Associate Professor of Law
University of North Carolina School of Law

Paul S. Kibel
Adjunct Professor
Golden Gate University School of Law

Janine Young Kim
Assistant Professor of Law
Whittier Law School

Richard Klein
Professor of Law
Touro Law Center

Ronald B. Lansing
Professor of Law
Lewis and Clark Law School

JoEllen Lind
Professor of Law
Valparaiso University School of Law

Christine A. Littleton
Professor of Law
University of California--Los Angeles Law School

Stephen Loffredo
Professor of Law
CUNY Law School

Susan Looper-Friedman
Professor of Law
Capital University Law School

Mary L. Lyndon
Professor of Law
St. John's University School of Law

Joan Mahoney
Professor of Law
Wayne State University Law School

Karl Manheim
Professor of Law
Loyola Law School

Mari Matsuda
Professor of Law
Georgetown University Law Center

Carolyn McAllaster
Clinical Professor of Law
Duke University School of Law

Miguel A. Mendez
Adelbert H. Sweet Professor of Law
Stanford Law School

Saul Mendlovitz
Dag Hammarskjöld Professor
Rutgers Law School—Newark

Binny Miller
Professor of Law
American University-Washington College of Law

Alan D. Minuskin
Associate Clinical Professor of Law
Boston College Law School

Margaret Montoya
Professor of Law
University of New Mexico

Laurie A. Morin
Professor of Law
University of the District of Columbia, Clarke School
of Law

Muriel Morisey
Associate Professor of Law
Temple University, Beasley School of Law

Kurt Olson
Professor of Law
Massachusetts School of Law

David Orentlicher
Samuel R. Rosen Professor of Law, Co-Director,
Center for Law and Health
Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis

Marcy E. Peek
Assistant Professor of Law
Whittier Law School

Ascanio Piomelli
Associate Clinical Professor of Law
Hastings Civil Justice Clinic

Nancy D. Polikoff
Professor of Law
American University-Washington College of Law

Deana Pollard
Associate Professor of Law
Texas Southern University, Thurgood Marshall
School of Law

Daniel J. Pollitt
Emeritus Professor of Law
University of North Carolina School of Law

James G. Pope
Professor of Law & Sidney Reitman Scholar
Rutgers Law School—Newark

Henry J. Richardson III
Professor of Law
Temple University, Beasley School of Law

William Richman
Professor of Law
University of Toledo College of Law

Joel Rogers
Professor of Law
University of Wisconsin Law School

Naomi Roht-Arriaza
Professor of Law
University of California--Hastings, College of Law

Daria Roithmayr
Professor of Law
University of Illinois College of Law

Tom I. Romero
Assistant Professor of Law
Hamline University School of Law

Michael M. Rooke-Ley
Emeritus Professor of Law
Santa Clara University

Constance L. Rudnick
Professor of Law
Massachusetts School of Law

David Rudovsky
Senior Fellow
University of Pennsylvania Law School

Margaret Russell
Professor of Law
Santa Clara University

Elizabeth M. Schneider
Rose L. Hoffer Professor of Law
Brooklyn Law School

Anne N. Schroth
Clinical Professor of Law
University of Michigan Law School

Herman Schwartz
Professor of Law
American University-Washington College of Law

Michael A. Schwartz
Assistant Professor of Law
Syracuse University College of Law

Elisabeth Semel
Clinical Professor of Law
University of California--Berkeley, Boalt Hall School
of Law

Katherine C. Sheenan
Professor of Law
Southwestern Law School

Marjorie M. Shultz
Professor of Law
University of California--Berkeley, Boalt Hall School
of Law

Abbe Smith
Professor of Law
Georgetown University Law Center

Paul J. Spiegelman
Director of Skills Training and Adjunct Professor of
Law
Thomas Jefferson School of Law

Clyde Spillenger
Professor of Law
University of California--Los Angeles School of Law

Joan Steinman
Distinguished Professor of Law
Chicago-Kent College of Law

Timothy Stoltzfus Jost
Robert L. Willett Family Professor
Washington and Lee University School of Law

Mark Strasser
Trustees Professor of Law
Capital University Law School

Marcy Strauss
Professor of Law
Loyola Law School

Susan P. Stuart
Associate Professor of Law
Valparaiso University School of Law

Suji Sutler
Associate Clinical Professor of Law
University of the District of Columbia, Clarke School
of Law

Richard S. Ugelow
Professor of Law
American University-Washington College of Law
Civil Practice Clinic

Reynaldo Valencia
Professor of Law
St. Mary's University College of Law

Penny M. Venetis
Clinical Professor of Law
Rutgers School of Law—Newark

Joan Vogel
Professor of Law
Vermont Law School

Martin Wagner
Adjunct Professor
Golden Gate University School of Law

Lawson Warner
Professor of Law
Howard University Law School

Susan L. Waysdorf
Professor of Law
University of the District of Columbia, Clarke School
of Law

Donald F. Wilkes, Jr.
Professor of Law
University of Georgia School of Law

Joan C. Williams
Distinguished Professor of Law, Director, Center for
WorkLife Law
University of California--Hastings, College of Law

Adam Winkler
Acting Professor of Law
University of California--Los Angeles Law School

Stephen Wizner
William O. Douglas Clinical Professor
Yale Law School

William J. Woodward, Jr.
Professor of Law
Temple University, Beasley School of Law

Richard W. Wright
Professor of Law
Chicago-Kent College of Law

Larry Yackle
Professor of Law
Boston University School of Law

Jonathan Zasloff
Professor of Law
University of California--Los Angeles, School of
Law