

## SEPTEMBER 2005

The New York City Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild announces its opposition to the nomination of John Roberts as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Despite repeated attempts by the Bush Administration to prevent the public disclosure of many of the nominee's positions on critical issues, sufficient information is known upon which we base our opposition.

During his career Judge Roberts has taken ultra-conservative positions on issues that are of importance to the National Lawyers Guild and to the constituents that our members represent. Opinions expressed by Judge Roberts as a lawyer in the Reagan Justice Department and White House Counsel's Office advocating for the reduction of the role of government and courts in enforcing civil and constitutional rights, During this period Judge Roberts argued for:

- Weakening proposed Voting Rights Act protections.
- Opposition to attempt to fortify the Fair Housing Act.
- Legislation that would have stripped the federal courts of their authority to remedy school desegregation with busing.
- Increased government opposition to affirmative action programs.

Later, as a Principal Deputy Solicitor General in the administration of George H.W. Bush, Judge Roberts continued to advocate for the restriction of civil rights protections when he argued for:

- The overturning of the *Roe v Wade* decision.
- An expansion of the role of religion in public schools.
- The position that federal civil rights law did not protect women from harassment by violent anti-abortion demonstrators at family planning clinics.
- An interpretation of a 1972 law banning sex discrimination in schools that would deny the ability of a young woman who was repeatedly harassed by her teacher to sue for compensatory damages.

Judge Roberts has continued to argue for the limitation of individual rights in the face of government abuse since being appointed to sit on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. Particularly troubling is his decision supporting the Bush Administration's position that accused enemy combatants may be tried for war crimes before military commissions lacking basic procedural safeguards, and holding that the Geneva Convention is unenforceable in U.S. Courts (*Hamdi v Rumsfeld*, 2005). At the time that this case was being argued before the D.C. Court, Judge Roberts was already being interviewed by the White House regarding nomination to an anticipated opening on the Supreme Court. He failed to disclose this potential conflict of interest to the lawyers arguing the *Hamdi* case.

In all of the above instances, and in many others, John Roberts has shown that he holds viewpoints that are hostile to civil rights and individual liberties. NLG President Michael Avery has recently commented that: "Despite saying he is opposed to judicial activism, the President has sought to remake the law in this country by appointing to the

federal bench a cadre of judges who will rule against regulation of industry by the federal government, in favor of state's rights, against civil rights and remedies for discrimination, against the rights of workers and consumers and against a woman's right to choose to terminate a pregnancy. Judge John Roberts brings a career advocating this vision on behalf of Presidents Reagan and Bush Sr. to the Supreme Court".

The National Lawyers Guild will be working to mobilize its members in opposition to the Roberts nomination, and calls on all people who believe in the rights of women, working people, racial minorities, people with disabilities, and in civil rights for all people, to take immediate action in opposition to this nomination.

The National Lawyers Guild, founded in 1937, comprises over 6,000 members and activists in the service of the people. Its national office is headquartered in New York City and it has chapters in nearly every state, as well as over 100 law school chapters.