

NYTimes

NOV 15 1971

The Court Appointments

In recent years, the Senate has been loath to argue about the judicial philosophy of Supreme Court nominees. It has generally assumed in the absence of damaging evidence to the contrary that any nominee who is intellectually qualified, honest and experienced in some branch of the legal profession will cultivate the detachment and perspective which the task of judging requires. But inasmuch as President Nixon has to a far greater degree than normal politicized the process of selection and has so insistently proclaimed his determination to remake the Court in his own image, the Senate needs to recall that its traditional deference to Presidential nominations is an institutional courtesy rather than a constitutional command.

Assistant Attorney General William H. Rehnquist's published belief that the Senate has an obligation to inquire into the basic philosophy of a Supreme Court nominee is applicable to his own position today. The question is whether the nominee should be evaluated by the Senate in terms of his specific political, social and economic views—quite apart from the obvious requirements of integrity, ability, temperament and training. Does not the President have the privilege of nominating to the Supreme Court a man or woman of any political orientation that pleases him, without interference by the Senate; or does the Constitution, through its "advise and consent" clause give the Senate the right to reject a candidate because it disagrees with his politics or his philosophy?

* * * *

The Supreme Court should be above politics; yet it is obvious that the Supreme Court deals with the stuff of politics. We have repeatedly argued that while the President owes it to the Court and the American people to keep partisan politics out of his judicial appointments, he ought to have the broadest latitude in his selections so long as they are made within the context of the American democratic system. What this means is that the candidate, whether liberal or conservative, of the right or of the left, must not be hostile to the broadly accepted principles of American constitutional democracy. This test the Senate has the right and duty to make.

The choice of Lewis F. Powell presents in this context relatively little difficulty. A leading lawyer of Richmond, a highly regarded member of the profession, a thorough-

going conservative in political philosophy, Mr. Powell has demonstrated during a long record of service to the community as well as to the bar that he has the requisite personal, intellectual and basic philosophic qualities.

The same cannot be said for Mr. Rehnquist. Though he is undoubtedly a capable lawyer of impressive academic and intellectual attainments, his entire record casts serious doubt on his philosophic approach to that pillar of the American constitutional system, the Bill of Rights. On every civil liberties issue—wiretapping, electronic surveillance, "no knock" entry, preventive detention, rights of witnesses before Congressional committees and state legislatures, the rights of the accused—Mr. Rehnquist's record is appalling. He seems to have scant respect for the individual citizen's right to privacy, relying on "self-discipline on the part of the executive branch" to provide the protection needed. But if "self-discipline" by Government officials were sufficient in such circumstances, why would this nation need the carefully defined safeguards of the Bill of Rights?

* * * *

What alarms us about Mr. Rehnquist is not the conservatism of his views—Mr. Powell certainly shares that characteristic—but our conviction on the basis of his record that he neither reveres nor understands the Bill of Rights. If this is so, then he certainly does not meet the basic requirement that a justice of the Supreme Court be philosophically attuned to the irrevocable premise on which the American political structure rests: the protection of individual liberty under law, particularly against the repressive powers of government.

The Constitution leaves room for a wide diversity of political and social interpretation and even of judicial philosophy; but through the issues of human freedom as set forth in the first ten amendments there runs a basic imperative that cannot be dismissed and must not be trifled with. A deep-seated respect for these liberties, a belief that they cannot be arbitrarily abridged or diminished by any power, even that of the President, is indispensable for service on the Supreme Court.

Mr. Rehnquist's elevation to the Supreme Court could have a critically regressive effect on constitutional protection of individual liberties for a long time to come. On Mr. Nixon's own premises, the Senate would be within its rights in insisting that while it may be content to accept a distinguished conservative like Mr. Powell, it is not obliged to accept a radical rightist like Mr. Rehnquist.