

## Democratic Soap-boxing



Written by Jonathan Browher Staff Writer

Volume 135, Issue 12 (01/17/06)

Recently The New York Times ran on its editorial page a sharp criticism of the President's current Supreme Court justice nominee, Samuel Alito. It was yet another sign that the collective forces of the contemporary liberal movement have been poised against the nomination of anyone affiliated with the current administration from day one, and that their objectives are far more narrow-minded and devious than their purported goal of finding the "best candidate for the job." The Senate Judicial Committee hearings for Alito are over, but Democrats want more.

It's no secret that Americans ranging from political pundits to everyday citizens to college students realize that every person has their own standards for Supreme Court nominees. For most Democrats in Congress, that standard is anyone whose pro-choice views are clearer than an abortionist's, and anyone not nominated by George W. Bush. Judicial committee members such as Ted Kennedy, as well as liberal groups like the People for the American Way, whose chairman stated that they have "just begun to fight" against the nomination, and the National Organization for Women, whose name is more synonymous with one-issue soap-boxing on abortion than with their efforts to improve women's lives, are fighting a losing battle, and they know it. Instead of focusing on constructive criticism or on other issues facing the nation, they have become obsessed with stopping a well-qualified and outstanding jurist from becoming the ninth judge on the Court simply because of ambiguous views on abortion and his identification as a self-described conservative.

If Alito was a self-described liberal and still had the same legal qualifications, would the hearings have gone the same way? It's doubtful. The Clinton era had its share of nominees, and none of them were given as much trouble as the Bush nominees. When a candidate's wife cries and leaves the room because her husband is being mercilessly bullied by thugs in suits with questions meant not to learn more about him, but to destroy him, you know there's a problem with our politicians. The committee room and the Senate floor look less like environments for nuanced debate and more like the OK Corral. Samuel Alito has received a full endorsement from the American Bar Association, calls Roe vs. Wade "established precedent" and has used such precedents as the basis for his rulings on the bench in lieu of his political beliefs in virtually every case where it has been an issue. He may not be a woman or a minority, but those factors shouldn't matter anyway when the nation's highest court of law is in focus. Democrats are obsessed with cracking down on scandal in the GOP while members of their own party are just as scandalous. Making Alito's wife cry is not being a good representative of your state's citizens. Neither is standing on a soap box or treating a man with impeccable credentials like an idiot. It doesn't help the Democratic party's image, and it doesn't do justice to the American people.

Close Window