## Microsoft Outlook

**From:** Cleeland, Nancy
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 1:25 PM
**To:** Solomon, Lafe E.; Garza, Jose
**Subject:** RE: request re Boeing article

*Exemption 5*

*Nancy Cleeland*
*NLRB Director of Public Affairs*
*(202) 273-0222*
*nancy.cleeland@nlrb.gov*

---

**From:** Solomon, Lafe E.
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 1:20 PM
**To:** Cleeland, Nancy; Garza, Jose
**Subject:** Re: request re Boeing article

*Exemption 5*

---
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

---

**From**: Cleeland, Nancy
**To**: Solomon, Lafe E.; Garza, Jose
**Sent**: Thu Jun 09 12:31:27 2011
**Subject**: FW: request re Boeing article

Fyi, I know your both out of the office but any thoughts would be appreciated.

*Nancy Cleeland*
*NLRB Director of Public Affairs*
*(202) 273-0222*
*nancy.cleeland@nlrb.gov*

---

**From:** Rosen, James [mailto:jrosen@mcclatchydc.com]
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 12:21 PM
**To:** Cleeland, Nancy
**Subject:** FW: request re Boeing article

**Nancy,**

**I'm taking the somewhat unusual step of sharing an email I sent yesterday to Sen. DeMint's communications director. As you'll see, it provides the comments of a former NLRB chairman (who you might know, or know of) who disagrees with Lafe Solomon's complaint against Boeing on the merits, but also strongly criticizes Republican lawmakers for politicizing the NLRB process and interfering with an independent agency.**

**Could I please get a statement from you or (preferably) from Lafe on this? The article I'm working on is a fairly big enterprise setup for the ALJ hearing in Seattle on Tuesday; it's intended to be a broad piece that will pull things together and help the reader who hasn't been following all the ins and outs of this case the last couple months. I know that Lafe put out a statement last month, but I would very much appreciate something**

**fresher – and perhaps more focused to respond to Gould below. I.e., why LS believes that his complaint is justified.**

**I'm writing tomorrow morning. Appreciate your help.**

**(And grateful if you don't share this email outside your office.)**

**Jim**

---

**From:** Rosen, James
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 4:17 PM
**To:** 'Denton, Wesley (DeMint)'
**Subject:** request re Boeing article

Hey, Wesley,

I'm doing a pretty big article to set up next Tuesday's administrative law judge hearing in Seattle on the Boeing-NLRB case. I did a long interview with William Gould, who chaired the NLRB under Clinton and is now a Stanford law professor.

Gould thinks Lafe Solomon is wrong on the merits of his complaint – i.e., Gould doesn't think that Boeing violated labor laws by opening the S.C. 787 plant. At the same time, Gould came down very hard on JDM – he specifically cited Sen. DeMint's use of "thuggery" – and accused him of politicizing the process to a dangerous extreme. He said the call by JDM and others for Obama to intervene is unprecedented and would undermine the rule of law. He said Democratic and Republican presidents for decades haven't intervened in NLRB proceedings.

Anyway, could I please get a response from JDM to this claim that he is politicizing the work of an independent executive agency – and thereby undermining the rule of law that separates the United States from most countries?

I know this sounds loaded, but don't shoot the messenger :>) I'm just forwarding what this fellow said.

(Please don't share this email or its contents outside your office.)

Thanks.

Jim



NLRB-FOIA-00004933