The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr. The Honorable Strom Thurmond Senate Judiciary Committee Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senators Biden and Thurmond:

As law school deans, teachers of law, and citizens vitally interested in constitutional and civil rights, we are writing to express our serious concerns about the nomination of Clarence Thomas to be an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Judge Thomas, in our view, lacks the experience, the commitment to fundamental constitutional rights and liberties, and the respect for law which are necessary prerequisites for elevation to this important position.

A decision to oppose confirmation of a nominee to the Supreme Court is never an easy one to reach. Judge Thomas has a compelling personal history of overcoming poverty and discrimination. He is only the second member of a racial minority group ever to be nominated to the Supreme Court, an institution where diversity of membership is significant. These factors, however, cannot qualify him for a lifetime seat on the most important Court in the land in light of the serious problems evident in his record and his philosophy.

Former Solicitor General Erwin Griswold recently commented that in replacing Thurgood Marshall on the Court, the President "should have come up with a first-class lawyer, of wide reputation and experience," but "that, it seems to me obvious, he did not do." Dean Griswold noted that Judge Thomas "has no breadth of experience at all." Indeed, Judge Thomas has been on the Court of Appeals for only 18 months. He does not have extensive experience as a practicing lawyer in the federal courts, where he has never argued a case, or as a legal scholar who has researched and taught concerning constitutional and legal issues. Prior to his appointment to the court, Judge Thomas' experience consisted almost exclusively of serving as director of the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the Department of Education and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Far from supporting his qualifications for the Court, however, that experience raises troubling concerns about his commitment to the rule of law and to civil rights protections for all Americans.

For example, while at OCR during 1981-82, Judge Thomas admitted in federal court that he was violating "rather grievously" a court order governing the processing of civil rights cases. At EEOC, he allowed over 13,000 age discrimination cases to lapse by failing to act on complaints filed with the agency. A federal court found in 1987 that his failure to act with respect to pension rights of older Americans was "entirely unjustified and unlawful" and "at worst deceptive to the public." Also at EEOC, he sought to abandon affirmative remedies for job discrimination that had been provided by Congress and upheld by the courts, first by claiming that the change was dictated by the Supreme Court's decision in the <u>Stotts</u> case and then, when that claim was demonstrated to be erroneous, by stating his "personal disagreement" with such remedies. Indeed, fourteen members of Congress, including 12 chairs of committees with oversight responsibility over EEOC, concluded in 1989 that Judge Thomas'"questionable enforcement record" at EEOC "frustrates the intent and purpose" of Congressional civil rights legislation and that he had demonstrated an "overall disdain for the rule of law."

In a series of articles and speeches over the past decade, moreover, Judge Thomas has expressed a deep hostility towards key Supreme Court precedents protecting fundamental individual rights and upholding Congressional authority in our constitutional system. At the same time, he has espoused a judicial philosophy based on "natural law" that provides no reliable anchor for constitutional adjudication and that could result in dramatic reversals of important Court precedents.

One important manifestation of the nominee's hostility towards fundamental rights has been his sharp criticism of a series of Court decisions implementing the school desegregation requirements of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in <u>Brown v.</u> <u>Board of Education</u> and of other Court decisions upholding the use of race-conscious remedies where necessary to remedy job bias and its effects. He has attacked a number of such precedents not simply as wrong, but as "egregious" or "disastrous." Indeed, he has specifically urged the overruling of the Court's decision in <u>Johnson v. Transportation Agency</u>, commenting that he hoped that the <u>dissent</u> in the case would "provide guidance for the lower courts and a possible majority in future decisions."

With respect to the right of privacy, Judge Thomas has criticized the Court's landmark decision in <u>Griswold v.</u> <u>Connecticut</u>, in which the Court struck down a Connecticut law banning the sale of contraceptives. In particular, he has attacked opinions in <u>Griswold</u> which relied upon the Ninth Amendment as a basis for the right of privacy, claiming that the decision represented the improper "invention" of the Ninth Amendment which would "likely become an additional weapon for the enemies of freedom."

At the same time that he has attacked the use of the Ninth Amendment as a basis for recognizing unenumerated rights implicit in the Constitution, however, Judge Thomas has espoused a "natural law" philosophy which claims that there are fixed objective truths derivable from higher law that somehow override the Constitution or other written law. The dangers of such a philosophy were illustrated during the <u>Lochner</u> era over 50 years ago, when a majority of the Supreme Court used it to invalidate minimum wage laws and health and safety regulations and to uphold such practices as excluding women from the practice of law. Since that time, courts and scholars have thoroughly repudiated this brand of constitutional decision-making.

Unfortunately, Judge Thomas' writings suggest that his "natural law" views are much more than simply abstract philosophy. He has asserted that the Supreme Court is justified in overturning the decisions of "run-amok majorities" as long as it adheres to natural law. Judge Thomas strongly endorsed an article that condemned <u>Roe y. Wade</u> on grounds that natural law requires the outlawing of abortion, calling the article a "splendid example of applying natural law." He co-authored a 1986 report that not only sharply criticized <u>Roe</u>, but also attacked other Court decisions protecting privacy rights by invalidating laws which forbade unmarried people from using contraceptives and prohibited a grandmother from living in extended family fashion with her son and grandsons. The report specifically noted that such "fatally flawed" decisions could be "corrected" by "the appointment of new judges and their confirmation by the Senate."

Our concerns about Judge Thomas are strongly reinforced by the persistent and vehement attack on legislative authority in his speeches and writings. Recently, he assailed the Supreme Court's near-unanimous decision upholding the authority of Congress to appoint special prosecutors to investigate charges of serious misconduct by executive branch officials. Judge Thomas claimed that Justice Rehnquist's opinion for the Court "failed not only conservatives but all Americans." Similarly, he has severely criticized Court precedent in <u>Fullicove v. Klutznick</u> upholding Congressional authority to enact legislation to remedy past discrimination. These views correspond all too closely with his harsh criticism and personal failure to cooperate with Congress in its execution of its oversight responsibilities over the EEOC, indicating a clear lack of respect for the legislative branch. For a potential Supreme Court justice charged with faithfully interpreting Congressional legislation and determining Congress' authority in our constitutional system, such views and actions are extremely troubling.

We do not contend that there are no respectable arguments to be mustered for some of the positions that Judge Thomas defends. Overall, however, his clear hostility to judicial protection for fundamental constitutional and civil rights and to Congressional authority is extremely troubling. This is particularly true with respect to the current Court, on which several members have already expressed interest in overruling prior Court precedents protecting individual liberty and mounting what Justice Marshall, in his final dissent on the Court, called a "far-reaching assault" on the Bill of Rights. Based on his record and his clearly expressed philosophy and beliefs, we are concerned that Judge Thomas would join in such a dangerous attack on our rights and liberties.

We urge you and the other members of the Senate to examine closely the record on Judge Thomas, particularly the findings of federal judges and Congressional committee chairs concerning how the nominee has performed his responsibilities. If you and other Senators conclude, as we have, that the nominee lacks the experience, the commitment to fundamental constitutional values, and the respect for the rule of law necessary, we urge you to fulfill your constitutional responsibility to withhold the consent of the Senate to the nomination.

Sincerely yours,

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW PROFESSORS AND LAW SCHOOL DEANS IN OPPOSITION TO THE THOMAS NOMINATION:

David E. Aaronson Kathryn Abrams Lee A. Albert George J. Alexander Gregory S. Alexander Norman Amaker Anthony G. Amsterdam Frank Askin Hope Babcock C. Edwin Baker Joan E. Baker Vicki Lynn Been Terence H. Benbow Paul Bender Susan D. Bennett Arthur L. Berney Barbara Black Louis D. Bilionis Alfred Blumrosen John Charles Boger Professor Michael H. Botein Professor Judith Olans Brown Professor John M. Burkoff Haywood Burns Scott Burris **Burton Caine** Paulette M. Caldwell Charles R. Calleros Norman Cantor Erwin Chemerinsky Richard H. Chused David D. Cole David D. Cole Drew S. Days, III Robert D. Dinerstein Father Robert Drinan David Filvaroff Nancy H. Fink Gary Francione Laura Gasaway Diane Geraghty Steven Gey Howard A. Glickstein David Goldberger Steven Goldstein Joseph R. Grodin

Professor American Univ. Professor Boston Univ. Assoc. Dean SUNY Buffalo Professor Santa Clara Univ. Professor Cornell Univ. Loyola Chicago Professor Professor New York Univ. Professor Rutgers Univ. Professor Georgetown Univ. Professor Univ. of Pennsylvania Cleveland State Univ. Professor Professor New York Univ. Univ. of Bridgeport Dean Professor Arizona State Univ. American Univ. Professor Professor *Boston Col/NY Law School Professor Columbia Univ. Professor Univ. of North Carolina Rutgers Univ. Professor Univ. of North Carolina NY Law School Northeastern Univ. Professor Univ. of Pittsburgh Dean/Professor City Univ. New York Professor Temple Univ. Professor Temple Univ. Temple Univ. Professor New York Univ. Professor Assoc. Dean *Arizona/Stanford Univ. Professor Rutgers Univ. Professor Univ. S. Cal. Professor Georgetown Univ. Professor Georgetown Univ. Dean/Professor Yale Univ. Professor American Univ Professor Georgetown Univ. Peter B. Edelman Assoc. Dean Georgetown Univ. Christopher F. Edley Jr. Professor Harvard Univ. SUNY Buffalo Dean Brooklyn Professor Professor Rutgers Univ. Professor Univ. of North Carolina Loyola Chicago Professor Professor Florida State Univ. Dean/Professor Touro College Professor Ohio State Professor Florida State Univ. Professor Univ. of Cal. Hastings

i

Phoebe A. Haddon Mark M. Hager Robert W. Hallgring Leora Harpaz Hendrik Hartog Susan N. Herman Bill One Isaac C. Hunt, J. Nan D. Hunter Alan Hyde Professor Sheri Lynn Johnson Jr. Professor James E. Jones, Jr. Professor David H. Kairys Professor Kalodner Dean Professor Professor Professor Professor Bill Ong Hing Robert B. Kent Patrick E. Kehoe Muhammad Kenvatta Sylvia Law Charles R. Lawrence Arthur S. Leonard James S. Liebman Richard B. Lillich Peter Linzer Robert J. Lipkin Jules Lobel David A. Logan Hugh C. Macgill Diane C. Maleson Holly Maguigan Martin B. Margulies Richard A. Matasar Finbarr McCarthy Michael Meltsner Carlin Meyer Binny Miller Elliott S. Milstein Wade J. Newhouse Charles Ogletree Laura Ellen Oren John Payne Nancy D. Polikoff Daniel H. Pollitt James G. Pope John W. Poulos Burnele V. Powell Margaret Radin Mark C. Rahdert Jamin B. Raskin Deborah L. Rhode

Professor Temple Univ. Professor Wake Forest Un Dean/Professor Univ. of Conn. Professor Temple Univ. Professor Professor Dean/Professor American Univ. Professor SUNY Buffalo Professor Professor Professor Professor Professor Professor Professor Professor Assoc. Dean Professor Professor Professor Professor

American Univ. Northeastern Univ. Western New England Univ. of Wisconsin Brooklyn Stanford Univ. Univ. of Akron Brooklyn Rutgers Univ. Howard Univ. Cornell Univ. Univ. of Wisconsin Temple Univ. Western New England Univ. of Virginia Albany Cornell Univ. American Univ. SUNY Buffalo New York Univ. *Stanford/Univ. S. Cal. NY Law School Columbia Univ. Univ. of Virginia Univ. of Houston Widener Univ. Univ. of Pittsburgh Wake Forest Univ. New York Univ. Univ. of Bridgeport Professor Univ. of Bridgepor Dean/Professor Chicago-Kent Professor Temple Univ. Professor Northeastern Univ. NY Law School American Univ. Harvard Univ. Univ. of Houston Rutgers Univ. American Univ. Univ. of North Carolina Rutgers Univ. Univ. of Cal. Davis Univ. of North Carolina Stanford Univ. Temple Univ. American Univ. Stanford Univ.

ii

Paul R. Rice Henry J. Richardson III John C. Roberts Michelle F. Robertson Yale Rosenberg Richard A. Rosen Albert J. Rosenthal Laura Rothstein David Rudovsky Elizabeth Schneider Michael P. Seng Ann Shalleck Sally Burnett Sharp Theodore M. Shaw Annamay Sheppard Steven H. Shiffrin Allen E. Shoenberger William H. Simon Nadine Taub Andrew E. Taslitz Kim A. Taylor William W. Taylor Paul Tractenberg William H. Traylor Robert M. Viles Burton D. Wechsler Hazel Weiser Welsh S. White Christina B. Whitman	Professor Professor Dean Professor	American Univ. Temple Univ. De Paul Univ. Univ. of North Carolina Univ. of North Carolina Columbia Univ. Univ. of North Carolina Columbia Univ. Univ. of Pennsylvania *Brooklyn/Harvard Univ. John Marshall American Univ. Univ. of North Carolina Univ. of North Carolina Univ. of Michigan Rutgers Univ. Cornell Univ. Loyola Chicago Stanford Univ. Rutgers Univ. Stanford Univ. Univ. of North Carolina Rutgers Univ. Stanford Univ. Univ. of North Carolina Rutgers Univ. Franklin Pierce American Univ. Touro College Univ. of Michigan
Welsh S. White	Professor	Univ. of Pittsburgh

* Indicates visiting professorship at second school listed.

iii