

**Center for
Constitutional
Rights**

666 Broadway
New York, NY 10012

(212) 614-6464
Fax: (212) 614-6499

Board of Trustees

Chairperson
Robert Bochen

President
Moron Stavis

Vice Presidents
Haywood Burns
Rhonda Copelon
Arthur Kinoy
William Kunstler
Peter Weiss

Treasurer
Judy Lerner

Board
Vicky Alexander, M.D.
Jane Casagrossi
Gregory Fieger
Margaret Fung
Jane Gould
Jane Jordan
Rochelle Koestan
Lucy Lippard
Wes Lobel
Jose Antonio Lugo
Victor McTee
Anita Melanoid
Jane Ransom
Sofia Rodriguez-Trias, M.D.
David Scribner
Arleta Williams
William Wapler

Executive Director
Arleta Maher

Staff
Joni Altogun
Margaret Casey
Matthew Chachere
Jill Cherry
Frank Deale
Joe Gibbs
Doris A. Grant
Gary Gundrum
Deborah Kershon
Dino Kim
Dora Martinez
Jayne Miles
Denise D. Miller
José Luis Motín
Crista Mullings-Rosa
Sara E. Rios
Audrey Seniors
Franklin Siegel
Cath Stephens
Viviane Torres-Frankel
Manda J. Twiss-Lee
DeAnn Woods
Dorothy Zellner

**TESTIMONY OF THE
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
on the
NOMINATION OF DAVID SOUTER
to the
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

Presented to: The Senate Judiciary
Committee

Presented by: Sara E. Rios
Staff Attorney
September 18, 1990

Good afternoon. I am Sara E. Rios, speaking on behalf of the Center for Constitutional Rights, a civil rights organization with a 24-year history of litigating constitutional issues to protect the rights of the poor and the oppressed, and to check excesses of government power. We urge the Senate to resoundingly reject David Souter's nomination to the Supreme Court.

Senators, the decision you are about to make is the single most significant decision to affect peoples' rights in decades. We believe that the consolidation of a conservative majority on the Court has seriously eroded individual rights, and that there is great danger that the United States Supreme Court will no longer stand as the insurer of equal justice for all.

With so much hanging in the balance, we urge you to focus on whether the nominee's life experience and legal record affirmatively demonstrate a concrete commitment to equal justice. You must apply a positive standard for justice and liberty, not a negative standard framed around the ideological brashness of a Robert Bork. You must apply a positive standard to reflect the role of the Supreme Court as contemplated by the Bill of Rights and Civil Rights Amendments -- that of a champion of minority rights over majoritarian oppression and inequitable legislation.

David Souter's history is clear when it comes to civil rights: one need not look very deeply into his writings in the now-famous literacy test case and Title VII case to see that Souter has no understanding of the experiences of people different from himself. One need not look very deeply into his advisory opinion on gay and lesbian parenting to see Souter's repressive

traditionalism vis a vis the family and civil rights.

We caution you to beware of the "confirmation conversion" which David Souter has skillfully tried to exhibit in these past few days. Souter has succeeded in not answering most of your questions; but he has bandied about liberal rhetoric with great facility, as if the mere use of words such as "privacy" and "affirmative action" undoes thirty years of attacking civil rights from the bench and as Attorney General. Unfortunately, the debate about Souter's fitness has been framed not by Souter's record, but by the negative standard of Robert Bork. It is not enough that a nominee merely agree with the landmark Brown v. Board of Education decision, for example; a nominee must demonstrate nothing less than a lifelong commitment to and involvement in making this country a safe and welcoming environment for those who are most oppressed. David Souter has no such history.

Let us not think that this man is a friend of women's rights because David Souter refers to "marital privacy" as a liberty, when he has not been pressed on its implications for marital rape and men's attempts to control women's reproductive freedom within marriage. Let us not be fooled by his characterization of himself as a hired gun for the governor when he was Attorney General. Our research shows unequivocally that the New Hampshire Attorney General plays a role which is entirely independent from the governor. Let us not be fooled by Souter's testimonial utterances that he abhors discrimination, when he also said that there is no longer any discrimination in New Hampshire -- a remark which bespeaks the insensitivity with which he has handled these issues

throughout his career. It is not enough for Souter to simply deny that he ever referred to affirmative action as "affirmative discrimination," when in his Title VII brief, he freely quoted from a book entitled Affirmative Discrimination, to advance his arguments that the State should not be compelled to collect statistics for the EEOC.

Seventeen years after Roe v. Wade, it is untenable for Souter to avoid stating his position on that landmark case, just as in 1971 it would have been unthinkable for a nominee to be uncertain of the wisdom of the 1954 Brown decision. Moreover, it is unacceptable for a nominee to be uncertain of his feelings about cases he handled as Attorney General in which he demonstrated particular disregard for civil rights.

Many vital cases will be decided soon by the Court. For example, in Rust v. Sullivan, if the government regulations are upheld, restrictions on abortion counseling in Title X clinics will limit women's freedom of reproductive choice by enforced ignorance of the alternatives available to them and repression of precious First Amendment rights. In the Johnson Controls case, a discriminatory employment policy directed against women and masquerading as an occupational health policy threatens to set a dangerous precedent for the elimination of women from the industrial work force.

The Court will no doubt address the recently passed Americans With Disabilities Act, and the regressive sections of the McCarran-Walter Act which exclude people from this country simply on the basis of their political affiliations. And most

frighteningly it will review Congress' final deliberations on the 1990 Civil Rights Act.

Negative decisions in these cases will have direct and dire consequences for your constituencies, and will have a disproportionate effect on people of color and the poor, signalling a retreat from progress and equal justice.

Senators, the United States Supreme Court is at a critical juncture. We submit to you that the current conservative majority on the court -- and David Souter, the nominee currently before you -- are out of touch with the profound aspirations of people of color, women, and many others to attain the fundamental rights outlined in the Bill of Rights.

The Senate possesses a grave duty to examine thoroughly the qualifications and mindset of this nominee to the Supreme Court. Because Souter has betrayed himself in these hearings as a jurist whose positions are inimical to the Bill of Rights, we strongly urge you to reject him and to press for a nominee who stands tall enough to hold high the banner of equal justice. We urge you to take on this fight and to engage in this heroic battle. History will not forgive us if we do not try. Otherwise it will be said that on the eve of the bicentennial of the Bill of Rights, you, the elected representatives of the people, forgot that freedom must be won anew, and by extraordinary efforts, in every generation.