

4-2-1972

## Should Requist Disqualify Self?

Jack C. Landau

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.uchastings.edu/publicity>

 Part of the [Judges Commons](#), and the [Legal Ethics and Professional Responsibility Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Jack C. Landau, *Should Requist Disqualify Self?* (1972).  
Available at: <http://repository.uchastings.edu/publicity/91>

This News Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Judicial Ethics and the National News Council at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publicity & News Clippings by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [marcusc@uchastings.edu](mailto:marcusc@uchastings.edu).

APR 2 1972 *By Keller*

## The Law

# Should Rehnquist Disqualify Self?

By JACK C. LANDAU  
Special to The Press from  
Newhouse News Service

WASHINGTON—Civil liberties lawyers went through a series of tense deliberations this past week on whether to file a formal request asking Justice William H. Rehnquist to disqualify himself from further participation in a pending U.S. Supreme Court case.

The case, which was argued before Rehnquist and the other eight justices on Monday, involves a claim that the Army's surveillance of civilians is so "intimidating" that it discourages political dissenters from freely exercising their first amendment rights of freedom of speech and association.

Rutgers University law professor Frank Askin, who argued the case, and American Civil Liberties Union director Melvin L. Wulf said they are "seriously disturbed" by Rehnquist's participation, based on the justice's testimony about the army spying case before a senate subcommittee two years ago when he was an assistant attorney general.

During that testimony, Rehnquist mentioned the Army spying case now before the Supreme Court—Laird v. Tatum—and said, "I do not think there is a First Amendment violation."

\* \* \*

**THIS IS** the same argument which Solicitor General Erwin Griswold made before the Supreme Court Monday in asking the high court to rule in favor of the government.

While disqualification motions are fairly common in the lower courts, court officials said there has not been a "serious" motion for disqualification of a Supreme Court justice in at least 20 years, although one said there are frequently "screwball" disqualification motions filed.

Askin and Wulf and their advisors in the civil liberties movement were sharply divided on whether a motion should be filed. Some of the questions they posed in meetings and in telephone calls to as far away as California were:

Does Rehnquist's testimony two years ago give "an appearance of impropriety" or partiality—which is the standard in the current American Bar Association canons of ethics?

Or does the 1971 Senate testimony now place Rehnquist in a position "in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned"—which is the new ABA standard in the proposed judicial code?

\* \* \*

**DURING** the testimony, Sen. Sam Ervin (D-N.C.) said he thought that civilians subjected to Army spying had a right to file an action against the government to stop any further Army surveillance.

"My only point of disagreement with you," Rehnquist answered, "is to say . . . as in the case of Tatum v. Laird . . . that an action will lie by private citizens to enjoin the gathering of information by the executive branch when there has been no threat of compulsory process and no pending action against any of those individuals . . ."



J. C. Landau