

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

April 6, 2022

The Honorable Kyrsten Sinema
317 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Mark Kelly
516 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Sinema and Senator Kelly,

Judge Jackson is perhaps the most radical nominee in the history of the country, and we urge you to oppose her nomination.

Her recent Senate Judiciary confirmation hearings revealed reasons that disqualify her from being confirmed to serve on the Supreme Court.

Judge Jackson is dangerous to children. Her record shows that she prefers to protect those who harm and exploit children over the children who are victims.

The case of U.S. v. Hawkins shows that she is not just soft on crime, but that she is soft on a particular type of crime: child pornography. An 18-year old man possessed and distributed hundreds of images of prepubescent boys being sexually assaulted. Federal guidelines indicated a prison sentence of up to 10 years, prosecutors recommended 2 years. Judge Jackson sentenced Hawkins to 3 months. After his release Hawkins reoffended.

Her softness in sentencing these types of crimes was the norm for her because she did not believe these individuals were pedophiles. Her position was not an aberration, it is reflected by her writings as far back as her law review days in law school some thirty years ago.

It is reflected in U.S. v. Cooper where she reduced a sentence for a person who downloaded and distributed more than 600 images of child porn including sadomasochistic images of infants and toddlers.

And the litany of instances of Judge Jackson's protection of pedophiles and pornographers is pervasive. In fact, it was in every case that came before her involving child pornography.

Republicans on the Committee requested that Chairman Durbin make documents concerning these cases available, but he refuses. One wonders what is in those files that are being withheld.

Judge Jackson is dangerous to the Constitution. She places Critical Race Theory on the same plane as the Constitution. She has supported the discredited 1619 Project. Her position indicates that she accepts the misguided notion that America is systemically and irredeemably racist. That kind of idea is promoted by those who believe that the Constitution is "garbage." How can she apply a Constitution that she believes is hopelessly flawed to the cases that come before her?

Judge Jackson is a danger to women. One reason President Biden nominated Judge Jackson is because she is a "black woman." Senator Marsha Blackburn, (R-Tenn.) referred to a decision written by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg that stated, "Physical differences between men and women ... are enduring."

Senator Blackburn asked if Jackson could define "woman." Jackson's response that she could not define a woman because she isn't a biologist demonstrates a certain radical point of view. It is not a view shared by most Americans, even those who are not biologists.

What is more troubling is that Senator Blackburn's entire line of questioning was predicated upon case precedent. Judge Jackson's facile answer demonstrates that she cannot be taken seriously as one who can understand the Constitution and correctly apply it to cases before the Court.

She has the same difficulty defining when life begins. One wonders how she can ever decide on an issue without a biologist by her side.

Judge Jackson ought not to be confirmed. Her judicial temperament and her radical view demonstrate that she will not uphold the Constitution, but will, rather, undermine the Constitution.

For these reasons we ask that you oppose Judge Jackson's nomination.

Sincerely,



Andy Biggs
Member of Congress



Debbie Lesko
Member of Congress



Paul A. Gosar, D.D.S.
Member of Congress