

# Case Against Rehnquist

WASHINGTON — William Rehnquist nears confirmation to a seat on the United States Supreme Court because dozens of Senators abdicated their responsibility.

Many liberal Republican senators chose to risk grave damage to the nation rather than embarrass their President again.

**IT HAS BECOME CLEARER** by the day that Rehnquist's views of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are so contrary to the mainstream of American opinion that, as a Justice, he would constitute a threat to millions of Americans.

Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey says: "The law is the only effective weapon that can secure equal rights for all Americans. I find in Rehnquist's interpretation of the law a total unwillingness to use it for these ends."

Newsweek magazine has published a memorandum written by Rehnquist when he was a 28-year-old clerk to Justice Robert H. Jackson, urging that the Supreme Court not overturn the separate-but-equal doctrine.

Jackson and the entire Supreme Court voted opposite to Rehnquist's views and outlawed Jim Crow in 1954. But 10 years later Rehnquist was still arguing for segregation.

Still two years later he was opposing elements of a model state civil rights law.

And even a year later, in 1967, he wrote

a public letter asserting that "we are no more dedicated to an 'integrated' society than to a 'segregated' society."

Humphrey notes that "Rehnquist was given several opportunities by Sen. (Birch) Bayh to disassociate himself from this philosophy during the Judiciary Committee's hearings. He did not do so."

The alarm finally began to spread over Rehnquist's tendency to construe individual rights in the narrowest fashion, over his broad defense of the executive branch's right to conduct surveillance and wiretapping at the expense of individual freedom, over his willingness to ignore the constitutional principle of checks and balances.

As Assistant Attorney General, Rehnquist was the architect and/or mouthpiece for many administration policies that ran roughshod over constitutional protections.

A lot of senators have been slow to warm up to the fight over Rehnquist. They have languished behind the incredible assumption that his philosophy is no cause for rejection, however inimical to the national interest it may be.

**WILLIAM REHNQUIST'S** past indicates clearly that what he stands for is not strict construction of the Constitution; it is quick destruction of the Bill of Rights.

A lot of senators may rue the day that Rehnquist won confirmation because they were too indifferent or timid to stand up.