

ONE QUESTION: WHY KAVANAUGH?

[NB: As always, check the byline.]

I don't have anything new to add to the work Marcy has done so far in her analysis of SCOTUS nominee Brett Kavanaugh's testimony and statements and those of [Dr. Christine Blasey Ford](#). Nor can I add to bmaz' [criticism of the subsequent investigation](#).

Voluminous amounts of material have been generated by this confirmation process, including a [redacted transcript of a Senate Judiciary Committee phone interview with Kavanaugh](#) released last evening. Myriad questions have been asked about Kavanaugh's past and his false statements. Given the confirmation process is a job interview, after all we've seen and heard publicly, it must be asked: *Why Kavanaugh?*

Why is the White House and the GOP portion of the Senate Judiciary Committee so deeply invested in Kavanaugh's confirmation?

Why do they remain staunchly behind him when they've long had a list of other identified SCOTUS justice candidates?

Why were those candidates, the first 11 [identified in May 2016](#) during the Trump campaign, inadequate such that Kavanaugh was [added later in November 2017](#) to the candidate list?

Is the man we've seen and read so much about really the very best candidate this White House could produce for this lifetime appointment?

Why is a man whose behavior was [so disrespectful](#) of the Senate, of the Constitution, of the need for neutral nonpartisan mindset so important that the White House and GOP SJC are willing to burn down what little goodwill remains with centrists and [with women and minorities](#)?

Why the sustained commitment to a nominee who [so easily lies under oath](#), in full view of the public?

Why stand so pat behind a nominee whose [license to practice law could yet be suspended](#) or worse because he has lied repeatedly under oath?

Do the White House and GOP SJC believe the average American would hire somebody who is supposed to be a careful arbiter of the law but who yells at and lies to his employers' representatives during an interview?

Why are the White House and GOP SJC willing to risk exposing yet more unpleasantness about Kavanaugh given how much has already surfaced about [his iffy finances](#) and his lying about his behavior in high school and college?

Why are White House and GOP SJC willing to risk negatively affecting the mid-term elections with their commitment to Kavanaugh?

Why the investment in social media to prop up support behind Kavanaugh – both in the form of [“revisions” to Wikipedia entries](#) related to terms questioned *during* last Thursday's hearing, and [tweets from the SJC's account](#)?

Why was a [Fox cable network interview](#) necessary for the nominee of a nonpartisan job?

Media is marketing – why does this nominee need to be promoted with the public?

Why haven't they teased an alternative nominee to test the public's willingness to support them in lieu of Kavanaugh?

Given an alternative candidate of comparable educational and work history, would the average American as an employer offering a lifetime appointment really pick Kavanaugh over anyone else?

Why are the White House and the GOP SJC insisting Kavanaugh's confirmation be rushed for what appear to the public to be wholly arbitrary reasons?

Everything about this confirmation process makes no sense; it undermines faith in the Senate Judiciary Committee and may taint the Supreme Court. We must know: *Why Kavanaugh?*

This is an open thread.