

Received(Date): 4 JUN 2003 12:42:58

From: "Weissmann, Henry" <WeissmannHX@mto.com> ("Weissmann, Henry"
<WeissmannHX@mto.com> [UNKNOWN])

To: "Miranda, Manuel (Frist)" <Manuel_Miranda@frist.senate.gov> ("Miranda, Manuel (Frist)"
<Manuel_Miranda@frist.senate.gov> [UNKNOWN]), Brett M. Kavanaugh (CN=Brett M.
Kavanaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

P6/b6

Subject: : Kuhl

[P_7QHGXG003_WHO.TXT_1.html](#)

[P_7QHGXG003_WHO.TXT_2.pdf](#)

Begin Original ARMS Header

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR:"Weissmann, Henry" <WeissmannHX@mto.com> ("Weissmann, Henry"
<WeissmannHX@mto.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-JUN-2003 12:42:58.00

SUBJECT:: Kuhl

TO:"Miranda, Manuel (Frist)" <Manuel_Miranda@frist.senate.gov> ("Miranda, Manuel (Frist)"
<Manuel_Miranda@frist.senate.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Brett M. Kavanaugh (CN=Brett M. Kavanaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

P6/b6

End Original ARMS Header

I attach a copy of a letter to the editor from Angela Bradstreet that was published in today's Daily Journal. Ms. Bradstreet is past president of California Women Lawyers and of the San Francisco Bar Association. I also believe that she has a good relationship with Senator Feinstein.

Best,

Henry

<<Kuhl Article.PDF>>

- att1.htm - Kuhl Article.PDF

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

File attachment <P_7QHGXG003_WHO.TXT_1>

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

File attachment <P_7QHGXG003_WHO.TXT_2>

I attach a copy of a letter to the editor from Angela Bradstreet that was published in today's Daily Journal. Ms. Bradstreet is past president of California Women Lawyers and of the San Francisco Bar Association. I also believe that she has a good relationship with Senator Feinstein.

Best,

Henry

<<Kuhl Article.PDF>>

Focus

LOS ANGELES DAILY JOURNAL • WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 2003 • PAGE 7

Letters to the Editor

Judicial Nominee Deserves a Hearing

I have not met or spoken with Judge Carolyn Kuhl. I have, however, reviewed much of her testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee and her record as a judge.

I am a staunch Democrat and a former president of California Women Lawyers and the San Francisco Bar Association. However, I feel an obligation to pose this question: Why should a judicial nominee, who has unequivocally and repeatedly stated on the record that she will follow and apply existing law (including *Roe v. Wade*), and who has the support of over 100 judges and both sides of the bar, including the Consumer Attorneys' Association, be denied a hearing for having advocated certain positions on behalf of clients as an attorney, long before she became a judge?

Kuhl's situation is very different from other recent nominees who have been subject to filibuster for valid reasons. Justice Miguel A. Estrada repeatedly refused to answer any questions on whether he would apply existing law, including *Roe*.

Justice Priscilla Owen's record as a judge includes her refusal to follow a Texas statute containing requirements for bypass of parental notification by

minors seeking an abortion. Instead, she inserted her own personal beliefs in order to adopt a much more stringent standard, which had no legal basis.

Such a record of what White House counsel Albert Gonzalez described as "blatant judicial activism" should not be condoned. However, since Kuhl has no such record of judicial activism, has repeatedly stated that she will follow *Roe* and has been applauded widely for her judicial temperament, it is troubling that some of my friends and colleagues in women's bar associations are demanding a filibuster of her nomination.

Surely such a nominee should not be denied a hearing for performing his or her duties as an attorney by zealously representing a client who happens to hold views with which others, including myself, vehemently disagree.

Such an approach does not represent the moderation for which we are all striving nor does it encourage qualified women candidates to submit to the rigors of the federal judicial selection process if they are not to be permitted a hearing on the merits.

Angela Bradstreet
San Francisco

Concessions Only Embolden Terrorists

How did Islamic terrorists react to the U.S. announcement that it would withdraw its troops from Saudi Arabia — a central demand of Osama bin Laden?

With bombings that killed at least seven Americans.

The terrorists interpreted the U.S. withdrawal as a concession to bin Laden's demands and as proof of U.S. weakness. From their perspective, the U.S. withdrawal shows that terrorism pays and that the more they terrorize Americans, the more they stand to gain.

The lesson to be learned is that concessions — apparent or real — will not change the minds of Islamic terrorists committed to destroying the United States and its influence in Muslim countries. Concessions only embolden them. If the United States wants to end Islamic terrorism, it must not appease terrorists but instead ruthlessly and methodically destroy them.

David Holcberg
Irvine