

## SUPREME COURT CONFIRMATION HEARINGS AND CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Before Supreme Court nominees are allowed to take their place on the high Court, they must face a moment of democratic reckoning by appearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Despite the potential this holds for public input into the direction of legal change, the hearings are routinely derided as nothing but empty rituals and political grandstanding. In this book, Paul M. Collins, Jr., and Lori A. Ringhand present a different view. Using both empirical data and stories culled from more than seventy years of transcripts, they demonstrate the hearings are a vibrant and democratic forum for the discussion and ratification of constitutional change. As such, they are one of the ways in which "We the People" take ownership of the Constitution by examining the core constitutional values of those permitted to interpret it on our behalf.

Paul M. Collins, Jr., is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas. His research focuses on judicial politics, with a particular interest in the democratic nature of the courts. The recipient of numerous research awards, he has published articles in the *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, the *Journal of Politics*, Law & Social Inquiry, Law & Society Review, the Notre Dame Law Review, Political Research Quarterly, and other journals. Collins is also the author of Friends of the Supreme Court: Interest Groups and Judicial Decision Making, which received the 2009 C. Herman Pritchett Award from the Law and Courts Section of the American Political Science Association.

Lori A. Ringhand is J. Alton Hosch Professor of Law at the University of Georgia School of Law. Her research focuses on the Supreme Court confirmation process and has been published in journals such as *Constitutional Commentary*, the *American University Law Review*, the *William & Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, and the *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law*. Ringhand is also the recipient of the 2010 Ronald Ellington Award for Excellence in Teaching.



> For Rose and Maggie and In loving memory of Michael, Jillian, Makayla, and Bryce Casey – PMC

> > For Mom and Dad
> >
> > – LAR



# Supreme Court Confirmation Hearings and Constitutional Change

PAUL M. COLLINS, JR.

University of North Texas

LORI A. RINGHAND

University of Georgia





> CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107039704

© Paul M. Collins, Jr., and Lori A. Ringhand 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Collins, Paul M.

Supreme Court confirmation hearings and constitutional change / Paul M. Collins, University of North Texas, Lori A. Ringhand, University of Georgia.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-03970-4 (hardback)

1. United States. Supreme Court. 2. Judges – Selection and appointment – United States.

3. Constitutional law – United States. I. Ringhand, Lori A. II. Title.

KF8742.C625 2013

347.73'2634–dc23 2013000441

ISBN 978-1-107-03970-4 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



### Contents

List of Illustrations		page ix
List	t of Tables	xi
Pre	face	xiii
1	A Confirmation Process Worth Celebrating	1
	Plan of the Book	8
2	How It Works: The Nuts and Bolts of the Confirmation	
	Process	16
	Supreme Court Vacancies	17
	Presidential Appointments to the Supreme Court	25
	Sidebar: Recess Appointments	31
	The Senate Judiciary Committee	34
	Sidebar: Hugo Black and the Ku Klux Klan	36
	Senate Treatment of Supreme Court Nominees	45
	After Confirmation	53
	The Nomination and Confirmation of Elena Kagan	54
	Conclusions	62
3	Public Opinion and Precedent at Confirmation Hearings	63
	Public Opinion and Confirmation Hearings	69
	Precedent and Confirmation Hearings	75
	Data and Methodology	78
	Sidebar: Statements Made by Outside Actors at the Hearings	81
	Empirical Results	85
	A Closer Look: The Economy and National Defense	88
	Conclusions	96



vi Contents

4	An Issue-by-Issue Look at the Hearings	100
	An Overview of Confirmation Hearing Dialogue	101
	A Closer Look at Confirmation Hearing Dialogue	107
	Civil Rights	107
	Racial, Gender, and Sexual Orientation Discrimination	111
	Freedoms of Speech and Religion	116
	Abortion and the Right to Privacy	119
	Hearing Administration	123
	Sidebar: Of Vampires, Werewolves, and Chinese Restaurants	125
	Nominee Background	128
	Judicial Philosophy	131
	Law, Crime, and Family	135
	Conclusions	137
5	The Discussion of Precedent at the Hearings	140
	An Overview of the Discussion of Precedent	141
	Which Precedents?	147
	Conclusions	158
6	Confirmation Conditions	160
	The Evolution of <i>Brown</i>	162
	Sidebar: Thurgood Marshall	169
	Gender Discrimination	176
	Lochner and the Path Not Taken	182
	Sidebar: Communism	183
	The Right to Keep and Bear Arms: A New Consensus?	191
	Conclusions	193
7	The 104th Justice	196
	A Brief Overview of the Bork Nomination	197
	The Rejected Constitution	200
	The Right to Privacy	202
	Gender Discrimination	205
	Racial Discrimination and Voting Rights	213
	Freedom of Speech	219
	The Kennedy Hearing	221
	The Affirmation of the New Consensus	225
	Conclusions	229



	Contents	vii
8	Currently Contested Constitutional Questions	231
	Investigating Privileged Responses	235
	A Case-Based Analysis of Privilege Claims	249
	Changes in Nominee Candor	254
	Mismatches	257
	Conclusions	264
9	Our Constitution	267
$Ap_i$	Appendix: Data and Data Reliability	
	The Coding of Variables in The U.S. Supreme Court	
	Confirmation Hearings Database	285
	Data Reliability	286
Index		291





### List of Illustrations

2.1.	Number of Supreme Court vacancies, 1769–2010	page 20
2.2.	Number of comments made by senators and nominees at	
	Supreme Court confirmation hearings, 1939–2010	42
2.3.	Supreme Court appointments by president, 1789–2010	50
2.4.	Senate support for Supreme Court nominees who received	
	roll call votes, 1795–2010	52
3.1.	Influences on the issues discussed at Supreme Court	
	confirmation hearings, 1955–2006	87
3.2.	Public opinion, unemployment, and hearing dialogue	
	involving macroeconomics, 1955-2006	90
3.3.	Public opinion and hearing dialogue involving defense,	
	1955–2006	92
3.4.	Influences on the issues discussed at Supreme Court	
	confirmation hearings, excluding macroeconomics and	
	defense, 1955–2006	96
4.1.	Percentage of civil rights comments at the Senate Judiciary	
	Committee confirmation hearings of Supreme Court	
	nominees, 1939–2010	108
4.2.	Percentage of civil rights comments involving racial	
	discrimination at the Senate Judiciary Committee	
	confirmation hearings of Supreme Court nominees, 1939–2010	113
4.3.	Percentage of civil rights comments involving gender and	
	sexual orientation discrimination at the Senate Judiciary	
	Committee confirmation hearings of Supreme Court	
	nominees, 1939–2010	114
4.4.	Percentage of civil rights comments involving freedom of	
	speech and religion at the Senate Judiciary Committee	
	confirmation hearings of Supreme Court nominees, 1939–2010	118



X

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-03970-4 - Supreme Court Confirmation Hearings and Constitutional Change Paul M. Collins and Lori A. Ringhand Frontmatter More information

List of Illustrations

4.5.	Percentage of civil rights comments involving the right to	
	privacy (non-abortion) at the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings of Supreme Court nominees, 1939–2010	121
4.6.	Percentage of civil rights comments involving abortion rights	
	at the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings of	
	Supreme Court nominees, 1939–2010	122
4.7.	Percentage of hearing administration comments at the Senate	
	Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings of Supreme	
	Court nominees, 1939–2010	124
4.8.	Percentage of nominee background comments at the Senate	•
	Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings of Supreme	
	Court nominees, 1939–2010	129
4.9.	Percentage of judicial philosophy comments at the Senate	
. ,	Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings of Supreme	
	Court nominees, 1939–2010	133
4.10.	Percentage of law, crime, and family comments at the Senate	
•	Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings of Supreme	
	Court nominees, 1939–2010	136
5.1.	Percentage of comments discussing Supreme Court	
	precedent at the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmation	
	hearings of Supreme Court nominees, 1939–2010	145
8.1.	The percentage of privileged responses provided by each	.,
	nominee, 1939–2010	256



### List of Tables

3.1.	The issues under analysis	page 79
3.2.	The influence of public opinion and precedent on the issues	
	discussed at Supreme Court confirmation hearings,	
	1955–2006	85
3.3.	The influence of public opinion and precedent on the issues	
	discussed at Supreme Court confirmation hearings, excluding	
	macroeconomics and defense, 1955–2006	95
4.1.	The issues addressed at the Senate Judiciary Committee	
	confirmation hearings of Supreme Court nominees,	
	1939–2010	103
4.2.	The most frequently addressed issues at the Senate Judiciary	
	Committee confirmation hearings of Supreme Court	
	nominees, 1939–2010	106
4.3.	The civil rights issues addressed by senators and nominees who	
	testified at the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmation	
	hearings of Supreme Court nominees, 1939–2010	111
5.1.	The most frequently addressed Supreme Court precedents at	
	the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings of	
	Supreme Court nominees, 1939–2010	148
5.2.	The most frequently addressed Supreme Court precedents for	
	each nominee at the Senate Judiciary Committee	
	confirmation hearings of Supreme Court nominees, 1939–2010	156
8.1.	The issue areas in which nominees most frequently invoke	
	privilege, 1939–2010	236
8.2.	The civil rights issue areas in which nominees most frequently	
	invoke privilege, 1939–2010	237
8.3.	The issue areas and subissue areas in which nominees most	
	frequently invoke privilege, 1939–2010	246

хi



xii	List of Tables	
8.4.	The Supreme Court cases in which nominees most frequently	
-	invoke privilege, 1939–2010	249
A.1.	Issues, subissues, and itemized subissues appearing in the data	282
A.2.	Intercoder reliability tests	288



#### Preface

The idea for this book began when Kirk Randazzo, a political scientist at the University of South Carolina, convened a workshop to bring together an interdisciplinary group of scholars interested in law and politics. It was the fall of 2009, and the country had just witnessed yet another contentious confirmation hearing. The highlight roll of this particular hearing, that of Sonia Sotomayor, featured clips about "wise Latinas" and the evils of judicial empathy. It also included the usual litany of complaints about senatorial posturing and nominee reticence, and revived the decades-old debate about the 1987 Robert Bork hearing.

As often happens at such workshops, the conversations of the day carried over into dinner, and we found ourselves huddled together at a sushi bar talking about our mutual frustration with the lack of comprehensive information about what actually happens at the confirmation hearings of Supreme Court nominees. Do Senators really just latch onto whatever is politically useful when preparing their questions for a given hearing, or do the hearings follow a more deliberative path? Have nominees actually become more reluctant to answer questions, or is that perception just a self-perpetuating post-Bork myth? Most importantly, are the hearings truly pointless exercises in political grandstanding, or is there a more positive story to be told about the role they play in our governing system?

We both believed there was, and the result is this book. The book uses empirical data, as well as historical vignettes culled from our review of hearing transcripts, to tell the story of the role the confirmation hearings play in ratifying constitutional change. In doing so, we have strived to make the book both accessible and appealing to a wide array of audiences. Political scientists are provided with an abundance of data to mull over, gathered from an original data collection effort, documenting the relationship among confirmation dialogue, public opinion, and the Court's precedents. Legal



xiv Preface

scholars will value our discussions of cases and doctrines, as well as our choice to present our data within a larger normative framework, thus providing a new way of thinking about how the hearings intersect with constitutional change. Non-academics will appreciate our efforts to translate both the data and the legal doctrines into readily accessible and thought-provoking themes of self-governance and the role of courts in a constitutional system.

We also hope that all of our readers will enjoy the stories we tell in the "Sidebars" sprinkled throughout the book. These stories use scenes from more than seventy years of confirmation hearings to show the striking, moving, and occasionally even humorous side of the hearings. They complement our empirical and normative work by providing an overarching view of the hearings that is too often lost in the heat of a given confirmation fight. The hearings discussed in this book span two world wars, the growth of America as a superpower, the civil rights movement, the cracking of the glass ceiling, and the fall of the Iron Curtain. Each and every one of these changes was discussed, debated, and fought over in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The hearing transcripts let us explore these changes through the words of those who lived through them, and show us how senators and nominees alike struggled to be true to our deepest constitutional commitments in a rapidly transforming world.

The story told by the changing faces of the nominees who have come before the Committee over the years is equally inspiring. As time passes, more and more of us become *present* on these pages. The New England aristocracy of Oliver Wendell Holmes shifts and makes room for Felix Frankfurter, a Jewish immigrant who came to this country at age twelve unable to speak English. Thurgood Marshall, the great civil rights lawyer, takes his seat after dismantling, step by painful step, the legalized apartheid system that tarnished our nation for so long. Sandra Day O'Connor sets aside her doubts and answers her President's call to become the first woman to sit on the Court. Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Sonya Sotomayor – more and more, these transcripts ring with the varied voices of America herself. We consider ourselves lucky to have spent the past few years immersed in this rich history, and we hope the Sidebars will give our readers a taste of the story these transcripts tell.

None of this would have been possible, however, without a great deal of help. Special thanks are due to Kirk, the University of South Carolina, and the National Science Foundation, who hosted and supported the conference that led to this book. Funding was also provided by the Dirksen Congressional Center and the Southern Political Science Association (through its recognition of a portion of this work as the recipient of the Neal Tate Award). Our own



Preface xv

institutions, the University of North Texas and the University of Georgia School of Law, have given us their unwavering support, as have our colleagues at those institutions. An early article based on some of the data used in this book appeared as "May It Please the Senate: An Empirical Analysis of the Senate Judiciary Committee Hearings of Supreme Court Nominees, 1939–2009" in the American University Law Review (Volume 60, pp. 589–641). We also are indebted to a host of graduate and law students who have provided able research assistance, including Anna Batta, Bryan Calvin, and Tom Miles, as well as Patrick Baldwin, Douglas Gladden, Nathan Goodrich, Nick Jones, Alexander King, Jonathan Milby, Kristin Rigdon, and Alex Sklut.

Numerous friends and colleagues provided valuable feedback at different stages of the project, including Henry Abraham, Sara Benesh, Ryan Black, Bethany Blackstone, Eileen Braman, Jonathan Cardi, Pam Corley, Jolly Emery, Matt Eshbaugh-Soha, David Fontana, Barry Friedman, Amanda Frost, Ben Gross, Paul Heald, Lisa Holmes, Stefanie Lindquist, Wendy Martinek, Joe Miller, Chris Nemacheck, Elizabeth Oldmixon, Ryan Owens, Rich Pacelle, Eve Ringsmuth, Neil Siegel, Amy Steigerwalt, Geoffrey Stone, Christian Turner, Rich Vining, Art Ward, Justin Wedeking, Elizabeth Weeks-Leonard, Sonja West, and Margie Williams. Special thanks are also owed to Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones for making their Policy Agendas Project data publicly available, and to Stacy Harvey, who played an essential role in keeping us organized and on track. We are additionally grateful for the comments we received on earlier versions of this work presented at the meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Southeastern Association of Law Schools, and Southern Political Science Association, as well as the American University Washington College of Law.

We also wish to extend our deepest thanks to John Berger, Rishi Gupta, and the team at Cambridge University Press, and to the anonymous reviewers whose insightful comments significantly improved the quality of this book.

Paul M. Collins, Jr., expresses his sincere gratitude to his family and friends for their continuing encouragement, good humor, and inspiration. He is especially indebted to his wife, Lisa, whose love, patience, and kindness make life a pleasure to live. Paul dedicates this book to his amazing daughters, Rose and Maggie, and to the loving memory of Michael, Jillian, Makayla, and Bryce Casey, who were with us for far too short a time.

Lori A. Ringhand thanks her family and friends for their ongoing support. She is especially grateful to her husband, Dan Lorentz, and her parents, to whom she dedicates this book. Without their love and support, this work would not have been possible.



xvi Preface

Finally, as this book was going to print we learned of the death of Senator Arlen Specter. Senator Specter served on the Senate Judiciary Committee for decades, and always fought to protect the role of the Senate in the confirmation process. For this he deserves our gratitude and thanks.