

CRISTIAN STEVENS

Cristian Matthew Stevens has been nominated to serve as a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. He currently sits on the Missouri Court of Appeals for the Eastern District. Stevens's legal writings and judicial opinions reveal a pattern of skepticism toward racial justice concerns in the criminal legal system and a consistent bias against workers in employment and labor disputes. His record raises serious concerns about how he would approach key issues of civil rights, criminal justice reform, and economic fairness if confirmed to the federal bench.

CRIMINAL LEGAL REFORM

Stevens's views on the criminal justice system — especially drug sentencing — reflect a troubling dismissal of well-documented racial disparities. In a 1997 law review article titled [*Criticism of Crack Cocaine Sentences Is Not What It Is Cracked Up to Be*](#), Stevens defended the harsh sentencing disparities between crack and powder cocaine, arguing that these laws might benefit Black communities. He framed increased sentencing for crack-related offenses as a potential “benevolent measure” meant to protect Black communities, despite overwhelming evidence that such policies have fueled mass incarceration and racial injustice. These views raise serious doubts about Stevens's ability to fairly assess criminal justice policies that disproportionately impact people of color.

LABOR AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE

Stevens's judicial record on the bench shows a consistent pattern of ruling against workers seeking justice for injuries, discrimination, or employer negligence. In [*King v. Missouri American Water Co.*](#), Stevens dissented from a decision allowing a disability discrimination case to proceed, siding with an employer's attempt to dismiss the claim. And in [*Cole v. Kansas City Southern Railway Co.*](#), Stevens's dissent indicated that he would have ruled against a railroad worker who was severely injured on the job — yet another example of his tendency to favor corporate interests over workers' rights and safety. Taken together, these rulings reveal a clear pattern: Stevens consistently sides with employers, even in cases involving unsafe conditions or discrimination, signaling a judicial philosophy that undervalues worker protections, undermines economic justice, and puts workers in danger.