

Jill Wine-Banks:

Welcome back to #SistersInLaw. I'm Jill Wine-Banks. Joyce is away this week but Kim, Barb, and I will be discussing how to negotiate in any situation, whether it's with an opposing party in a lawsuit, your neighbor or spouse, or the Taliban, then we will take time to celebrate the 101st anniversary of the 19th Amendment and examine the processes facing refugees and those seeking asylum in this country. And as always, we look forward to answering some of your questions at the end of the show. But before we begin, it's summertime, and that always makes me think of music. And so I want to talk about some of your favorite songs of the summer. And... Go ahead, who wants to start this one? Barb, you want to start?

Barb McQuade:

Yeah. It's funny you ask, Jill, because I am not a big music listener. If I am listening to a radio or device, I mostly listen to podcasts or the Tiger game on a summer night. But in the summer I really like to listen to songs that give that summer mood, that just gets you feeling like summer. And there's a great song. I don't know if you guys know this song that's popular now called Solar Power by Lorde. It's got the best summer vibe. It's a little bit spacey but it's got a little bit of a beat. My teenage daughter turned me onto that one, I'm not usually so current. But all the old stuff like Martha Reeves and the Vandellas with Dancing in the Street-

Jill Wine-Banks:

Oh, wow.

Barb McQuade:

Or Chicago, Saturday in the Park. There's that song by Stevie Wonder Summer Soft. Drift Away by Dobie Gray. There's some more recent songs. Childish Gambino has that Feels Like Summer, that's a good one. And, Kim, I remember when she tweeted about Summertime by will Smith.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yes.

Barb McQuade:

That's a good one, that one's kind of fun.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

It's a classic.

Barb McQuade:

It gets you in the summer mood. So I just like listening to the songs that get me in the summer mood. What about you?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

First of all, as you're talking I'm literally writing this down and like I'm going to make a playlist.

Barb McQuade:

Yeah, they're on a playlist.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Of these all songs. It's sounds really good. Yeah, I like to listen to music particularly in the summer. A good one that comes to mind is Summer Breeze by Seals & Crofts.

Barb McQuade:

Oh, yeah.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Yes.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

It's a good one.

Barb McQuade:

I'm going to put that in my list.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

And then also redone by The Isley Brothers which is also fantastic. That's always on my summer playlist. I love music in the summer, but I love it all the time and lately I've been listening to it a lot in the evening just to wind down. And this was a pretty busy and difficult news week with everything that was going on. And I often turn to nostalgia and one of my favorite albums when I was younger was the first album from Tracy Chapman. And I was listening to that the other day and tweeted that one out which is a favorite, I know Barb you responded to.

Barb McQuade:

Yeah, there's a great song, the whole album is great.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

It's a great whole album. Music is something that I always turn to. I know my husband loves listening to Frank Sinatra and Stevie Wonder and Aretha Franklin, so there's always some music playing.

Barb McQuade:

Yes. Stevie Wonder and Aretha Franklin are great.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Fantastic. [crosstalk 00:03:24].

Jill Wine-Banks:

Always your husband, yes indeed.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

What else, Jill? What else do you like-

Jill Wine-Banks:

Well-

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

... To listen to?

Jill Wine-Banks:

Obviously I'm the oldest one here and my songs are almost anything from the '50s and '60s, I love all those songs. And that goes back to things like Itsy Bitsy Teenie Weenie Yellow Polkadot Bikini. It goes back to Surfin' USA by The Beach Boys.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

A great one.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Dancing in the Streets, Martin and Vandellas. Hot Fun in the Summertime, Sly & The Family Stone, Under The Boardwalk, The Drifters.

Barb McQuade:

Oh, yeah. That's a good one.

Jill Wine-Banks:

I mean, when I listen I really like to feel energized, I want to get up and dance. And my husband and I frequently actually do start doing the twist or just jumping around doing rock and roll. And it's just a fun thing for us to do, so those are the ones that I liked the best.

Barb McQuade:

We should ask our listeners to share with us their favorite summer songs, I want to make a playlist too.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yes.

Barb McQuade:

I've got one going but I'd love to add to it and sometimes you don't think of all the good songs yourself. I've added some of yours to mine and, listeners, please share with us your favorite songs and so on.

Jill Wine-Banks:

That would be so much fun.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

And also, Barb, the listeners helped you last week with-

Barb McQuade:

Yes.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

... Finding soft drinks.

Barb McQuade:

Yes, I'm glad you mentioned that, Kim. We got a lot of great responses. I have this quest to try to give up diet pop, and yes it is popping at soda, we also got a lot of comments about that. And I got a lot of great ideas about drinking water, drinking sparkling water, adding fruit to sparkling water, using... What do you call the device, Jill, that has the machine that puts the bubbles in?

Jill Wine-Banks:

The soda Stream or-

Barb McQuade:

Soda Stream, yeah. I get some people-

Jill Wine-Banks:

The pitcher that has the diffuser in it.

Barb McQuade:

Yeah. And you sent me some pictures on that. So, thank you to all our listeners who are helping me to kick the pop habit. I will report that I've been pretty good this week drinking mostly sparkling water. I've had two diet Cokes and they were delicious, but I'm working on it.

Jill Wine-Banks:

What are you drinking right now, Barb?

Barb McQuade:

Baby steps, baby steps.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Hold up your glass, I want to see it.

Barb McQuade:

Oh, here, Jill.

Jill Wine-Banks:

It's empty. Okay, well, it was a Fresca the other day, bad girl. Okay, let's get a little bit more serious. We have three really good topics this week. And in some way they all kind of have something to do with Afghanistan, as our listeners will hear as we proceed. The first topic, which I mentioned in the introduction, was basically how to negotiate with anyone about anything. And I want us to talk about

what we've all learned from our life experiences that apply to negotiating, whether it's with the Taliban, your boss, your spouse, an unreasonable neighbor. Barb, do you want to lead us through that, please?

Barb McQuade:

I would love to. And in fact, I'm going to start this conversation with just a little bit of background on what's been happening in Afghanistan. I know all three of us have been heartbroken to see these images coming out of Afghanistan for the people of Afghanistan, people trying to climb onto planes as they're lifting off and falling, some to their death. It's been a heartbreaking week as people are trying to get out of Afghanistan with the withdrawal of U.S. troops after 20 years. Following the attacks of 9/11 we went into Afghanistan. The goal at the time was in response to 9/11 we wanted to find, disrupt, and destroy Al Qaeda, including Osama bin Laden.

And that piece of the mission was largely successful but then it grew into 20 years of nation building and trying to keep the Taliban away from the Afghani people and that's been a bit of a mess. And we saw as soon as the U.S. troops began to withdraw there was a very quick takeover of the country and its capital by the Taliban took about five days. And the Taliban is, for people who haven't followed this closely, a political and religious group that was in power before the U.S. first attacked in 2001. And when the Taliban had been in power they had all kinds of very harsh rules about the treatment of women, religious minorities, like they don't let women attend school, for example, and be educated. Also harsh treatment for political opponents. And the expectation is that we will soon see more of the same, including punishment for those Afghans who assisted the United States. And so our hearts go out to all of those people who are there and attempting to evacuate.

The situation though came about as part of negotiation, a deal negotiated by President Trump in 2020. And I will say also it appears to me to be a plan that was very poorly executed by the Biden administration, so I think the fault there needs to be shared equally by a number of administrations. But Trump's deal promised to remove U.S. troops in exchange for an agreement not to harbor terrorists. And some critics have faulted this deal itself for lacking really a longterm strategy.

Don't harbor terrorists. Once you leave, once you've played your card you've lost all leverage to enforce the provision that you think is important about harboring terrorists, right? I mean, they may say, "Yes, we promise not to harbor terrorists," once you're gone, you've lost that leverage to encourage them to comply with that. And so once President Trump made it clear we were leaving originally he said in May, Biden extended it until late July and early August. The Afghan forces basically rolled over, they lost their ability to fight once the U.S. left and so the Taliban regrouped quickly and they stormed back into power.

It was that conversation that got us talking about negotiations. Looking at the deal that Trump negotiated seems like such a bad one in hindsight. And so we wanted to share some of the thoughts and tips that we have picked up over the years in our work about negotiating. And, Jill, I know you've worked for... You were general counsel of the army, you worked for Motorola, and you have been involved in disputes with neighbors. Can you tell us about whether it's negotiating with an opposing party in a lawsuit or a neighbor or a spouse or the Taliban, what are some of your best tips for how to negotiate in any situation?

Jill Wine-Banks:

Let me start with an example that talks about really how you could negotiate with anyone. And my negotiations have included with the Pakistan government, with our own government, with business

partners, with defense counsel. But one thing I learned, and I took a class that my law school Columbia offered for alums, about how to negotiate with unreasonable people. And it gave a wonderful example.

It said, "There are two people bidding on the only crate of a particular type of orange and the price is skyrocketing beyond anything that is reasonable. Neither of them can really afford it but neither of them is going to give up because they both have a critical need for this. But what they don't know is that each of them needs a different thing from the orange. One needs the rind and the other needs the juice. So they don't have to bid against each other, they could actually work together and get this for a fraction of the price and both could have what they want."

The real first thing is to identify what is it that you really want from this negotiation and try to think about and what does the other side want and can you get it? I had a dispute with a neighbor and it turns out that he really only wanted the fence to face in a certain direction so that he would see the front of the fence. I only wanted it to be tall enough that I didn't have to see into his yard. And so it was easy to resolve when I realized that I'm happy to have the fence face any way you want as long as it's the height I want. And so I learned an important lesson from that and I think that applies in so many things.

But the first and most important part of this is to identify your goal and to look for a common goal with the other side. And then you have to be clear in expressing what it is that you're settling on, what is the agreement? And as you were pointing out, Barb, in discussing what happened with negotiating with the Taliban, it's, as long as they don't Harbor terrorists, well, what enforcement do we have? How will we know they aren't doing it? What are the details of that? So you have to not only identify your goal but a way to make sure that the goal is achieved and that the other side carries through on it.

The other thing that I learned because my negotiations particularly in business, where my first assignment was Pakistan, but I also worked in Russia, Ukraine, China, Japan, Europe, South America, is the culture difference in each country. And even if you're looking for the same goal in each country you can't do it the same way. You have to take into account the cultural differences... Well, in Pakistan also because Sharia law governs you also have to take into account the differences in the legal system. But being astute even in terms of when you first meet them, in some countries, if you don't take the time to build a relationship with the other side they will never come to an agreement with you. That's very important, you have to spend time having meals with them and getting to know them.

That's not always true in some countries but in many it is. And you have to learn, can you sit and cross your leg or is that an insult to them? There are so many little details that will make a difference to whether you and they can get along. My advice is, pay attention to what your goal is, look for the other person's point of view, listen to them, here them, pay attention to the cultural differences and find a way to make sure you work out the details that otherwise your venture will end up failing.

Barb McQuade:

Well, that's some great advice. How about you, Kim? You've wanted to be a lawyer all your life, what have you learned in your lifetime of negotiations that you can share with our listeners?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yeah, I haven't negotiated with as many folks, I certainly never negotiated with foreign nations or even our nation like Jill has. But the first person I ever negotiated on behalf of was my mom and that was long before I was a lawyer, even when I went to law school, I was a teenager. I can't remember if I was in high school or college, but I had gone out for a walk with my mom at a local park. And there was an

uneven sidewalk on the path that goes around this lake. And my mom tripped on it, fell. She hit her head on the ground and needed some medical care. She was okay but she did get hurt in all of this. And of course we notified the park officials immediately who had to come in with a golf cart and come get us back to our car because my mom was really shaken up and a bit dizzy afterwards.

Well, afterwards the folks from the park reached out to us to talk a little bit about this. And I was present since I was a witness and I was there both on the scene and afterwards, they actually came out to our house and there was a little negotiation that happened and I learned a lot. First of all, one of the things that I learned is to know your facts. And at the time I remember the folks asking my mom, "Okay, well, what happened? You said you were dizzy, did you get dizzy and then you fell?" And I said, "No, we were walking, she was fine. She tripped and hit her head and she was dizzy after she hit her head." Those are a very different set of facts than the one that was being put forward.

And I proved to be a good witness. And in the end the park ended up paying not only for my mom's... Reimbursing her for the medical expenses but also giving her a little settlement amount that I helped negotiate as well.

Barb McQuade:

You.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

It's undisclosed and I charged-

Barb McQuade:

This is before you're even a lawyer?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Before I was-

Jill Wine-Banks:

She was a natural-born lawyer, what she was.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

I charged my mom a lot less than the normal-

Barb McQuade:

Yes, you made the usual retainer.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

But I took that into being a lawyer into my profession to know. I think one of the other things I learned from that experience is to express confidence in your position. I'm not talking about puffery or saying anything untruthful-

Barb McQuade:

Exactly.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Knowing where your strong points are, making your case and making it confidently, it makes such a big difference. If I was unsure or tentative in that situation it would have come out a lot differently. And I certainly felt that way when I was on the other side of the negotiating table with opposing counsel when I worked as an attorney. And certainly that happens with anyone even if they are negotiating something like offense, if you express confidence in what you want, what you know, that is going to get you a lot farther than if you seem tentative or unsure.

Definitely I agree on the point where Jill is talking about building a relationship. I found it really helpful just to be amiable, just to be not a jerk. There are a lot of jerk attorneys that I found when I practiced in litigation. I never took that route and I find that you can bring a lot more people to the table if you treat them respectfully, if you treat them nicely, if you don't make things that don't need to be adversarial or disagreeable, if you don't do that. If someone asks you for extra time, for example, to get a document request to them, if they need another week or two of course say yes, if it doesn't bother or put you or your client at any disadvantage certainly grant them that grace. Things like that. And I found that that has certainly gotten me a lot farther in helping folks.

I know we mentioned briefly in the employment context, I think this is particularly important for women. And I have found this as a professional, when you're trying to do something like negotiate a contractor or ask or negotiate a salary, is know your worth. That's difficult a lot of times when you don't know what people are making, or you don't know exactly what to ask for. There are so many studies that show one reason women are so systematically underpaid compared to men, just because they don't ask for the money that they deserve. They don't ask to be compensated for their time in the way that men just are naturally brought up to do that.

So always know your worth, always don't give any work away for free and don't be afraid to ask for it in negotiation. The worst thing that can happen is people say no, and these are some of the skills that I brought along the way. Certainly a lot of things that Jill said, I appreciated and learned along the way, too, in my practice and in life.

Barb McQuade:

Yeah, those are all great pieces of advice, Kim, and same with Jill. I learned an awful lot about the art of negotiation in my very first job out of law school I was a law clerk for a U.S. District Court judge named Bernard Friedman, wonderful judge, wonderful mentor, friend to this day. But he was a master at settling cases, he was so good and I watched and learned what he did and learned some lessons that have served me well as a lawyer throughout my career.

One really simple one is, don't go first. If you let the other person go first you learn a lot about where they are. You might've been happy with some smaller amount and they offered you way more than you were ever going to ask for in the first place, so if you can get them to make the first offer, that can be extremely valuable. The other is to listen to the full offer. Hear them out, make sure you understand it and listen to it, so being a good listener as well.

There's a very good example of this on an episode of Seinfeld, I don't know if you guys are Seinfeld fans. But do you remember the episode where Kramer spilled his latte all over himself had burned himself, he mocking that McDonald's case that had happened in real life. And he hired a lawyer and the lawyer said, "All right, we're going to negotiate with the coffee company at their headquarters. And let me do the talking, don't say anything, we're just going to listen. That's our job today."

And so they walk in and they sit down and they show a scene before they enter the room where the group of very sophisticated-looking lawyers in their fancy suits and everything and there's like six of

them. And they say, "All right, remember our deal. We're not going to go above a million dollars. And I don't know, can we throw in a free coffee for life or something?" "Yeah, sure. Whatever that sounds fine." They come in and they say, "Mr. Kramer, let's get right to the point. We are prepared to offer you free coffee for life." And Kramer jumps up and says, "I'll take it." So he lost his million dollars cause he didn't listen, so you got to listen as well.

Another one is don't bid against yourself. If you've made an offer for \$1000, don't make the next offer, you need to wait for your adversary to bid next so you find out where you are. And so you should never come back if they say no to 1000, you don't now come back and say, "Well, how bad would you take 800? You have to let them tell you where they are. Are they close to a thousand or are they not even in the ballpark, they're at \$10 so you get a feel for where they are in all of it. But back to the point that Jill raised about the win-win situation, I think is so important and she said you might have to dig a little bit.

And one of the great things Judge Friedman did was spending a little time with each party to find out what it was they really wanted and I think oftentimes the lawyers assume it's all about the money and that the plaintiff wants as much money as they can get and the defendant wants to pay as little as possible and that's it. But so often there are other variables at play. A lot of times it's also about respect. In an employment case so often if a person feels like they were aggrieved by their employer, what they really want is an apology, that can be worth an awful lot of money. So it isn't just that.

And I can think of a case that Judge Friedman settled that was just fantastic on this point. There was a major auto company that was suing a small toy maker. The toy maker had made unlicensed replicas of a particular sports car and so the automaker had a very strong case of trademark infringement. They never got permission to use this trademark and they made these toys. And during the negotiations the car maker said, "We want them to cease and desist making the toys and we want them to destroy all the toys in their inventory." And the toy maker agreed to the cease and desist part but they just could not bear the idea of destroying all these toys that they spent a lot of time and research and development making.

And so judge Friedman came up with this great creative win-win compromise. He said that the toy company would stop making the toys and they agreed to that and that together they would donate the toys to children's hospitals all over the country. And so the two companies ended up issuing a joint press release and walked away out of court like old friends, I mean just a total win-win. So when you really dig into what matters to either parties, there are more variables than just the obvious ones like the money. And so I think that that, Jill, you raised a really good point and finding ways for win-win is the way to win a negotiation.

Jill Wine-Banks:

It's that old, I need the rind and you need the juice. But the other part of that is it's compromise is not losing, compromise is when you both win and we need to keep that in mind. I played golf yesterday and I was wearing my Girlfriend Collective skort, and I really thought it was terrific. Have any of you tried that one?

Barb McQuade:

I too have the skort and I play golf, Jill, I didn't know you played golf except I don't wear skorts when I play golf, maybe I should. Again, it creates this expectation that you actually have game and that you're pretty good. Maybe that's something I'll aspire to. But I do like the skort and I own it and wear it for

other purposes and I find the Girlfriend Collective clothing to be really functional, and breathable, and comfortable. How about you, Kim, have you been wearing their stuff?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yeah, it's funny. I was out on a hike with my husband recently and he turned to me and said, "You look really nice."

Barb McQuade:

Wow.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Which he never tells me when I've been my athletic gear and I was wearing Girlfriend Collective. I was wearing the leggings and the top and they have nice colors. I was wearing a nice, eggplant-like color and he dug it. So it's nice to get out and do your activities and still look stylish, so Girlfriend Collective, thanks for that.

Jill Wine-Banks:

We've all been wearing nothing but athletic wear and yoga pants and sweat pants, but now you can do that and look good. Isn't that a big deal?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

It is really great. And Girlfriend Collective is sustainable, ethically made active wear. With their inclusive sizing from extra, extra small to six XL, their incredible bras, legging, shorts, tanks, tees, and swimsuits are the perfect choice for anyone, and don't forget the skorts.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Whether you're working out running errands or doing nothing at all, Girlfriend Collective has functional fabrics, colors and styles for any activity, and all their clothing and packaging are 100% recyclable.

Barb McQuade:

Their best selling leggings come with pockets. One week we're going to have to do a whole episode dedicated to ode to the pocket, to pockets.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yes.

Barb McQuade:

And they have different levels of support, you'll find the perfect fit. And so they also have the garment take-back program, which they call ReGirlfriend. When you change styles you can return pieces for upcycling into new girlfriend gear.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Join us in joining the collective today. For listeners of the show, Girlfriend Collective is offering first-time customers, \$25 off purchases of \$100 or more when you go to girlfriend.com/sisters.

Jill Wine-Banks:

That's \$25 off \$100 or more when you go to girlfriend.com/sisters. Again, girlfriend.com/sisters. That's of course for this hashtag, SistersInLaw, or look for the link in our show notes. Another topic, which also can be related to Afghanistan a little, particularly to the women and girls in Afghanistan and beyond is our celebration of the 101st anniversary of the 19th Amendment, which passed and became law in America in 1920. And, Kim, you're going to lead our discussion of that topic.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yes. This week, as you said, marked the 101st anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment, which gave women a constitutional right to vote. And it came after a long fight and it was a long time coming. To this day, I'm amazed at the fact that women in this country did not get the constitutionally-protected right to vote until the 20th century. I mean, I just think that's incredible, but I digress. The 19th Amendment is also misunderstood in a lot of ways. It did not by itself grant a full right to vote to all American women. Barb, I want to start there. Talk about that, talk about what the amendment did and did not do.

Barb McQuade:

Yeah. I think this is a really interesting angle on the 19th Amendment. I think we all celebrate it as this great thing where women got the right to vote and, like you came on, just a guess that it took until 1920 when you think about our country's formation in the late 18th century. But the 19th Amendment if you look at the language of it actually does not affirmatively give the right to vote to women. The text says, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." So it says you can't discriminate on the basis of sex, it doesn't say women get to vote.

And so, in other words, after the ratification of the 19th Amendment states we're no longer able to say you can't vote just because you're a woman, but they still did some of the same things we see today in terms of voter suppression. And so state officials who wanted to stop people from voting, who happened to be women, had other ways to do that. And so they used some of those same suppression tactics that we see. And they appear neutral on their face but they have a disparate impact on women.

One was poll taxes, women didn't have their own bank accounts and property and funds to be able to pay poll taxes. And although it may have been that white women had the ability to vote, there were Jim Crow laws in the south that kept all black people from voting including black women. And so there they use poll taxes and literacy tests and grandfather clauses, the old, you can only vote if your grandfather could vote. Oh, what's? That your grandfather was a slave, oh, well, too bad for you.

Indigenous women were not permitted to vote in 1920 when the 19th Amendment was passed because they were considered wards of the state. Most Asian women were not permitted to vote because the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 barred Chinese immigrants from becoming U.S. citizens. And so by the early 20th century it was extended to all immigrants from Asia, so they weren't allowed to vote either. It wasn't until the passage of the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act that these restrictions on Asian Americans were permitted to become citizens and then able to vote. And then there's the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that helped end some of these suppression efforts that is now being eroded.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yeah. It's really important to remember that part of the history as we celebrate this milestone. And another thing that's important is remembering the intersection of women's suffrage rights and the fight for rights of other groups. When I was away a couple of weeks ago, one of the places that I got to go was the site of the 1948 Women's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, New York. And it was really striking because on the building right next to the building which still stands where this convention took place is this mural. And it includes not only the pioneering women of the suffrage movement like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott and Mary Ann McClintock and Jane Hunt, but also a part of this mural is a portrait of Frederick Douglas, the famed abolitionist who spoke at that convention. And according to the historians there gave one of the most rousing addresses of the entire convention in favor of women's voting rights.

And there were also representatives, it's important to note, there's also representatives of the indigenous nations whose members also spoke at this convention then which is amazing, we think about that in 1848, and they are also represented in this mural. And so think of that, at the height of the women's suffrage movement it was also the height of the abolitionists movement, it was before the Civil War, it was before the Emancipation Proclamation had been signed. And so abolitionists like Frederick Douglas understood importance of the suffrage movement. In fact, the Seneca Falls convention itself grew out of the fact that a lot of these women had gone to the 1814 anti-slavery conference and because they were women they weren't allowed to speak. And so they decided they were going to get together and fight for the rights of women so that they could advocate for the rights of others as well as themselves, which is really fascinating.

But, alas, this harmony would not last forever. While for example black women were a crucial part of suffrage efforts from the beginning, not all the folks involved believed that they should have been. And as Barb said the right to vote was never granted immediately, it was hard fought for, it took a lot of other things to make it more real, so it still isn't fully realized, but to make it more realized. And even those who supported suffrage, a lot of them supported it in that they wanted wealthier, privileged white women to be able to vote. Didn't always include people in other marginalized groups, poor people, people who were not landowners or whose husbands in some cases were not landowners, black and brown folks, immigrants. They did not always think that if those people were allowed to vote that the things that they would vote for would be aligned with the issues that were important to them and so they were often left on the sidelines.

And that was part of the reason for this conflict between folks who are supporting abolition and subsequently civil rights and those who were supporting suffragists. For example, Stanton, she opposed the 15th Amendment, which bars the denial of the right to vote based on race because it would grant black men the right to vote before women, and in that time, in that case, it meant white women. And so that was part of the reason that ultimately Frederick Douglas was no longer a part of that suffrage movement that he was so instrumental in helping to start and a lot of black and brown folks were sidelined in those times. I think we still see today when we see civil rights efforts and calls for equality, you see a lot of allyship but sometimes there's still difficulty between different groups whose interests you could think that we could all embrace but sometimes chief against one another and that certainly was the case at the beginning of the suffrage movement.

Jill, the 19th Amendment and the rights of women that they have fought for serve as an international model in a way, despite our problems, but the state of women's rights around the globe is still quite uneven. We are seeing a clear example of that with what's going on in Afghanistan. Can you talk a little bit more about that? How has America affected the world with respect to the right to vote and women's rights in general?

Jill Wine-Banks:

First of all, I am proud of everything about America and what we've accomplished and what we've allowed, but it is important to note that we actually weren't readers in terms of women's right to vote. New Zealand, which is also one of the countries that's led by a woman right now and has had one of the best responses to COVID was the first, and that was in 1893 so it was way more than 20 years before we got around to doing it. And I have to say that the fact that voting was ever an all-male purview is something that makes me sick to my stomach and shows how much women have had to overcome and how much we still have to overcome.

We don't have equal representation in Congress. There's never been a woman president. We came close to shattering that glass ceiling but we didn't make it. And by the way, even Afghanistan proceeded us in giving women the right to vote, only by a year, but they were ahead of us. And as Barb has made clear, voting rights are still restricted here. And unfortunately we're going backwards so now it's restricted for men and women because of the state initiatives to restrict and suppress the vote.

And another example I'll give from, for example, from Afghanistan, women do have the right to vote. Even though they don't have the right to go to school and work, they've been taken out of the workplace to a large extent, but facially neutral things which can be a problem for women are there. For example, recently Afghanistan passed a rule that said that to avoid voter fraud, that may sound familiar to our listeners because we've railed against the nonsense of voter fraud here, but to avoid voter fraud they needed to verify who the voters were and so they had to use facial recognition, which meant photographing an uncovered face.

Impact in Afghanistan, women who leave the house have to cover their faces, so if they had to uncover their face for a man to photograph them so that they could vote they weren't going to be able to vote. And that is right now a pending issue where there is negotiations between women's rights groups and the, I guess it'll now be with the Taliban, to allow either have a female officer at every polling place who could do the photograph because you can reveal your face to a female. But it's that sort of thing that still is holding women back.

And in terms of other things because your question sort of goes beyond just voting, jobs, the right to work. When I got out of law school there were help wanted ads that said, "Help wanted male and help wanted female," and women couldn't apply for the male jobs. Salaries were not equal. In the military there were certain jobs for men only. Even though a woman might have all of the skills it took a woman couldn't apply for that job. And there were a lot of things like you couldn't be raped by your husband under the law, even though of course, any woman would know that you could. What this all comes down to in my view is that we still need the Equal Rights Amendment. It almost passed in my early years but it didn't and I think we need to have a new movement to get the Equal Rights Amendment to get true equality in this country.

Barb McQuade:

Well, I agree with you, Jill. Can I just chime in? This idea of disparate impact is a really important one and I think so often people miss that. They think that as long as the law is facially neutral then that there is no discrimination. And I got a lesson in this very early in life. I remember as a kid reading about a girl who wanted to play in the EPSN Michigan Little League. I was probably a little younger than she was so I was watching the story carefully. And I remember asking my mom to explain it to me.

And what they said was, "We have a rule in this league that every player who plays must wear a protective cap, so you need to wear a protective cap if you want to play." And she didn't want to wear that, she refused to wear that. But it was a way of pushing her out of the league to say, "You're not

welcome here and we want you out," and so there was a battle over that. But that is the way that people can use your facially-neutral rules to discriminate against women and so I think we really need to look past those things. Just like these voting rights things when they put in poll taxes and grandfather clauses and all of those kinds of things, there is a devious effort to use these facially-neutral things as a pretext to promote one group over another.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

I think that's really important. And I think all of this shows just even though we have made a lot of progress that there is still a long way to go.

Barb McQuade:

Hey, Jill, I haven't used Function of Beauty yet. What is it?

Jill Wine-Banks:

It's a terrific product. It is skin care and hair care, shampoo, conditioner, and it's all based on you take a test and they customize the product for you. It's not like just going to the drugstore and picking up a shampoo that meets your needs, this one you say to them, "I want my shampoo to make my hair shiny, make it less frizzy," whatever the thing is, "I want it thicker, thinner," or whatever. And they blend it specifically for you and they adjust the color of the shampoo and the conditioner so that you can actually tell the difference when you're in the shower, not wearing your glasses. They also will customize it with a fragrance or leave it fragrance-free. And I really think it does exactly what they promise it will do. I liked the shampoo and conditioner so much that I actually bought their face cleanser and it's a really good face cleanser. Have you tried it, Kim?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

I have. I love the fact that you can take this quiz. I often, especially because I have a very thick, curly, dry hair, like a lot of black and brown folks do, and sometimes I go to the store and I'm trying so many different products just to find the one that works best for my hair. And I took this quiz. I was a little skeptical, I won't lie, but I got the shampoo and conditioner and it really, it gets my hair clean without feeling it's stripped of all its moisture. The conditioner feels great and I chose the fragrance-free option, which is really good because I like to wear my own perfume and stuff and I don't want it to compete, and I really, really love it.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Function of Beauty is the world leader in customizable beauty, offering the perfect formulas for your hair's needs. To get started, take a quiz about your hairstyle and goals. Choose your color and fragrance go fragrance-free, dye-free, or switch them up based on how your hair looks and feels each season.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

After the quiz, Function of Beauty will send you your 100% customized formula. Function of Beauty also just launched an amazing subscriber program, Function with Benefits. Subscribing gets you discounts on every order, a free treatment every four orders, access to exclusive fragrances in colors, early access to new products and much more.

Barb McQuade:

Man, I got to try this. So turn your good hair days into a good hair life. Go to functionofbeauty.com/sisters to take your quiz and save 20% on your first order. [Functionofbeauty.com/sisters](https://functionofbeauty.com/sisters), to let them know you heard about it from us and to get 20% off your order. [Functionofbeauty.com/sisters](https://functionofbeauty.com/sisters), or look for the link in our show notes.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Let's move on now to our third topic. We haven't talked about general immigration issues like the crowd seeking asylum but forced wait outside our borders in Mexico or the dreamers who are here and can't get full recognition and rights. And I hope we'll do that in the future but right now, as Barbara described in introducing the topic of negotiating and talking about what's happening in Afghanistan, there is a humanitarian and moral crisis facing America right now as a result of our leaving Afghanistan after being there for 20 years.

And although President Biden addressed this issue in a press conference just about an hour before we're recording this, there is still a real problem. There are over 300,000 Afghan civilians who have been affiliated with our U.S. mission there, yet only 16,000 of those have been issued an SIV, which is a Special Immigrant Visa to allow them to come, and that is since 2014 so we're talking about seven years. There are currently more than 18,000 applications in the pipeline, as well as thousands who aren't even eligible for this particular program but who are in dire need of protection. And they are eligible to apply for an SIV, the Special Immigrant Visa, but can you tell us, Kim, let's start with that, our understanding, what is the SIV process and specifically how long does it take, so how many people is it going to be able to save?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yeah, these are great questions, Jill. And I just want to say that all of this that we're talking about is an overview I think our listeners know. There are a few areas of law that are more complex and complicated than immigration law so this is not meant to be an exhaustive discussion of this but an overview of this process just to give folks and myself included a better idea of what's going on. The Special Immigrant Visa program in Afghanistan was set up in 2009 to protect allies who helped U.S. troops and other U.S. nationals in the country, literally doing so at the risks to their own lives. We are talking about people like interpreters, translators, contractors, and other workers who assisted Americans and allowed American troops and nationals to do the work that they needed to do there. They were really crucial in that.

And among those at the greatest risk for these entire 20 years and certainly right now are individuals who have worked with U.S. or with NATO, also people working with women's rights and other advocacy groups, and also those working for human rights groups and journalists. And so it applies to Afghans who provided these services to help the U.S. in Afghanistan. It also applies to their spouses and to their children who are under 21 years old. And as Jill said, there are an estimated 300,000, more than 300,000 Afghans who are eligible but since 2014 only 16,000 SIVs have been issued. Now, this is in part due to just the backlog in the process. And this is like you said, going back to 2014, this is before more recent problems such as the pandemic and certainly now, the unrest that is happening in the country that is slowing down that process even more.

Last month Congress passed and the president signed a new law that's designed to help speed up this process. It boosts the number of authorized visas by 8,000. Now, that's important. It helps again, we are talking about 300,000 people, so it's a drop in the bucket but it's a move in the right direction. And it's meant to boost the speed at which these applications can be processed by doing some things

like postponing the medical examination requirement until the applicants reach the United States, this was something that was supposed to take place before they left before.

It also changes the employment requirement, the amount of time they had to have been in those employment positions from two years to one and it also opens the program to the surviving spouses and children of the workers who were killed. The goal is to, like we said, get rid of this backlog and produce a process where these applications can be processed in as quickly as 30 days. I am skeptical of that number but that is what is stated in this legislation.

The Biden administration also says it's taking other steps to speed up the process, including implementing a new Priority 2 Designation of people who were affiliated with the U.S. effort in Afghanistan and also gave assistance but who do not meet all of the requirements to qualify under the SIV program. But they still will have to wait. If they have to flee Afghanistan they will not be able to come into the United States while they wait for this process to play out, they will have to go to a third country to wait in the meantime. Keep in mind that even with all of these programs in place, it's just a drop in the bucket of the people who need it.

Another thing that the United States is going to have to do is to convince NATO and convince its allies to also step in and provide some assistance to a lot of the people who need to flee Afghanistan at this time. Once the people who are seeking SIVs through the United States arrive here they are designated as parolees, that's the name under the federal law. And they will be eligible for some limited services like medical care, case management, and resettling services, and they're provided by the International Rescue Committee as well as some other affiliated organizations.

Now, the big question that remains is why didn't the process of speeding these up knowing that the United States had agreed to this pull-out, why didn't this process start earlier, much, much earlier so that we didn't see what unfolded this week. And President Biden pointed to two factors. He said, first of all, a lot of Afghans didn't want to leave before all the events of the last 10 or 11 days started, and also Afghan officials urged against a big evacuation of Afghan nationals for fear that it would cause widespread panic. I'm not sure that what has unfolded was better than whatever fears of widespread panic there may have been.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Those are such good points, Kim. And if we look at the numbers, just the sheer volume of this are, it doesn't sound like we are going to be able to meet our moral obligation. We promised the people who helped us that we would get them out and August 31st is our withdrawal date.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yes.

Jill Wine-Banks:

That's what? 10 days from now. And even if we could process the applications the planes can only hold five to 9,000 a day, that's not going to get 18,000, maybe 18,000 could get out, but it's not going to get out the hundreds of thousands that need to. What's the solution? Is it to extend the time deadline for us to leave? Is it to transport them to a third country for processing? Is it to add staff in-country to process them? What are the ways we can approach this?

Barb McQuade:

Yeah, I think some combination of all of those things, Jill, is necessary. And I agree with you that we have a moral obligation to help these people. It's, you said, there's 300,000 Afghan civilians who've been affiliated with U.S. military and only 16,000 SIVs have been issued since 2014. And so we've got a lot of applications in the pipeline and now we have this new program. And it's not just, I think people think of it as just people affiliated with the military. So there are translators and advisors who do help the military but then there are also these non-government organizations that with the assurance that the U.S. was going to protect them from the Taliban have set up schools for girls and other things that are now in grave danger, not only their efforts but their own personal safety.

Because they were promised and they believed us, the United States. And we came in and said, "We will provide a safe haven for you to do this important work," when we were involved in a more of a nation building effort than simply our initial effort to go in there, the mission really evolved over those 20 years. And now that we're leaving... And I don't disagree that it's the right decision. As President Biden said at some point it's a forever war, the mission is futile and you could stay there forever and not accomplish anything. But I do think we have some moral obligation to the people who helped us and who we promised that we will protect them from the Taliban.

I think some of the things, extending past August 31st for our withdrawal, it doesn't seem likely. President Biden was pretty ruthless in that speech for the guy who's known for being so warm and touchy-feely, and empathetic and all those things, that speech was pretty cold. It was, "We had to do it, we pull the plug, I take responsibility, boom, I'm gone." That I think I don't see us staying beyond August 31st for that purpose.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Barb, I heard something different in his speech because when he was pushed he did say, "One, we will get out all American citizens and, two, yes, we will evaluate that departure date when it comes so that we can meet our obligation." He did recognize an obligation to all of those that we had allowed to help us, had asked to help us, had promised an exchange that they would be protected. And he is now saying yes that they will consider and I take that as that they will stay for some period of time, or going back to your topic, they will negotiate with the Taliban to do something to allow safe passage and to get the people out. I don't see-

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

But he said that today. He had two speeches before that, that I would agree with Barb, didn't I? But to that aspect of it.

Barb McQuade:

I think buying time is what they really need to do. And one way to buy time is to find a third place where they can be and stay for processing until they come to the United States. But as you say, Jill, just the logistics of getting them on planes and out of the country I think is going to be impossible unless we can extend that deadline beyond all this 31st. But I think in the meantime... And I also think there's a very legitimate fear about this. Yes, we want to allow them into the United States. I mean, maybe some people disagree about that but I think we have a moral obligation to do that, to take them in. Maybe other NATO countries will agree to take some as well, but there is a legitimate basis for processing people. In a country that has a history of sponsoring terrorism I think that there could be people who try to exploit this program-

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yes.

Barb McQuade:

To get into the United States.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yeah, absolutely.

Barb McQuade:

And so I think you have to be careful of that as a matter of national security.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

I certainly agree with that.

Barb McQuade:

And you can do that, but you could do it in a military base.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yes.

Barb McQuade:

I heard, Ben Rhodes, the former Obama Foreign Policy Advisor on a podcast today saying that our based on Guam, for example, could accommodate very large numbers for a short period of time while you do this processing and this background check and other things to make sure that they're not going to pose a danger to the United States when they come here. And that would be a way of just buying some more time before you allow them passage into the United States.

Jill Wine-Banks:

I'm very glad you made that point. Yeah, go ahead, Kim.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

I was going to say, I didn't mean to step on you, Barb, I apologize for that. I just think that it's a really important point to make because I think sometimes people disingenuously make the argument that this creates a national security risk. We have seen this in the refugee crisis from Syria, we have seen this in other circumstances. There are few people who enter this country who are vetted more thoroughly than those making a SIV or refugee or asylum requests. They are vetted heavily. It would be for a terrorist group to sort of use that as a key hole would be unwise because that would be-

Barb McQuade:

Which is why we need to continue that vetting.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yes. Correct, correct. They're going to be cleared.

Barb McQuade:

I don't think we can just say, "Forget about it, just get out of there and come to the United States." But having some way station along the way where they could stay for a while, while we complete that work I think would help alleviate that problem.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Exactly. And there is a difference between the SIV situation and refugees and asylum seekers and it might be worth at another time to pursue that. A little known fact is that I actually had an immigration practice at one point when I was a partner at a law firm, although we represented-

Barb McQuade:

Jill, is there anything you haven't done?

Jill Wine-Banks:

Yeah. Let's see, I haven't sung in public and I never will. That will forever be something I'll never do. But, yeah, I mean, I represented of course except for a few pro bono cases, large corporations who were bringing in a top executive to work in America and needed a green card for them. But because of the pro bono work I did I saw the need for asylum and refugee and I don't think we're doing it as well as we could and I'd love to explore that with an expert at some point. But I think, I hope our audience from this has learned a lot about what the delays are and what the legitimate reasons for vetting people is, why we need to do that, but where we have to meet our moral obligation to help the people that helped us.

Barb McQuade:

Well, I don't love talking about my undergarments, so, Kim, will you talk about ThirdLove?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

I love ThirdLove because you know what, Barb? I don't like thinking about my undergarments, and with ThirdLove I don't because they're comfortable, I put them on and then I can put it out of my mind for the rest of the day. It fits nicely under my clothing and that's exactly what I look for in a good set of undergarments. What about you, Jill?

Jill Wine-Banks:

The thing that's amazing is yesterday someone from the University of Illinois was visiting and out of the blue happened to say, "I've recently heard an ad for something called ThirdLove, have you ever heard of it?" And I went, "Oh, yes, I have and in fact, I'm wearing one right now and I'm not even aware that I'm wearing it because it's so comfortable." I really have found them to be supportive but with no binding or discomfort, it's really, it's a great product. It's just really works very well.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

It's like what you need in a friend? Someone who is supportive but who doesn't bug you, and that's what happens here.

Barb McQuade:

Oh, God, where's Joyce when I need her?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

ThirdLove creates high quality underwear, sleep, and loungewear with cup sizes from AA through I, including exclusive half cups, and lounge in sleepwear in sizes extra small to 3X. Get ready to feel good. You take the easy fitting room quiz and ThirdLove takes care of the rest, focusing on your fit, on your size and shape and current issues and your personal style to deliver bras and underwear that are perfect for you. They even have stylists on standby.

Jill Wine-Banks:

I love their washable silk pajamas. ThirdLove took silk and added a soft, a peach touch, so you can feel amazing even while getting your eight hours sleep although I bet none of us gets eight hours of sleep, but I do feel in them.

Barb McQuade:

ThirdLove gives their gently used returned bras to women in need, donating over \$40 million in bras so far, and they've even healed some injured turtles.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

ThirdLove knows you deserve to feel comfortable and confident 24/7, so right now they're offering our listeners 20% off the first order. Go to thirdlove.com/sistersinlaw Now to find your perfect fitting bra and get 20% off your first purchase. That's thirdlove.com/sistersinlaw for 20% off today. Look for the link in our show notes.

Jill Wine-Banks:

As always, we've received some great listener questions this week. If you have a question for us for next week, please email us at sistersinlaw@politicon.com or tweet using #SistersInLaw. If we don't get to your question during the show keep an eye on our Twitter feeds throughout the week where we'll answer as many of your questions as we can. And today the first question comes from, Linda. And, Kim, I'm going to ask you to answer this one. Her question is, "We talked about statute of limitations and I didn't hear much about what does DNA do to the time to bring someone to trial? Can you talk about DNA and trials?"

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Yeah, that's a great question. I think it's important to start with the difference when we're talking about DNA, about its use as inculpatory evidence and exculpatory evidence. That means inculpatory evidence of guilt, essentially, or exculpatory evidence of innocence of a defendant. Now, it's important to know that at any point in time, even after a conviction, if new evidence is brought up that tends to prove the innocence of someone who is a defendant, that can be brought up at any time, that has nothing to do with the statute of limitation. So if DNA evidence proves that someone did not commit a crime, that evidence can be brought forth at any time and it should be brought forth in any time. And we have seen time and time again, one of the most important uses of DNA evidence is to vindicate people who are wrongly convicted, so that's an entirely different thing.

I think there is also a false idea about the use of DNA evidence as proof of guilt, you have to be very, very careful of that. It takes a lot of evidence, a full scope of evidence in order to meet the burden

of beyond reasonable doubt and proving guilt. And often with DNA, there are a lot of other factors that come into play. There is chain of custody, where this DNA was, where this evidence was, who had it, who had access to it. You have the fact that a lot of times DNA evidence of lot of different people will be present in a crime scene particularly if it's a home or someplace where people have been, where they've eaten, or they have left here behind. DNA evidence in itself is rarely by itself proof of guilt and that's the thing to keep in mind, it's mostly used as proof of innocence.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Great answer, Kim. And, Barb, I'm going to turn to you for the next question from, [Satcam 01:04:25] Sid. "What's the benefit of the growing number of plea deals for prosecutors?" And I think I'm reading that question as in terms of the January 6th insurrectionists.

Barb McQuade:

Yes. And we've seen a number of plea deals that have been accepted by defendants. I think there are probably a couple of different categories. First is just sort of the low-hanging fruit. You approach somebody and you say to them, "Here's a video of you inside the Capitol, you have entered a restricted area. If you go to trial you will be convicted. If you want to plead guilty you can plead now and we will not oppose a request for probation or we'll agree to cap your sentence at six months and you can argue for probation," or something like that. I think a lot of those cases they will dispense with quite easily.

And there is an advantage to the government. The government is usually willing to give up something, sentencing guidelines will usually give a reduction in an offense level for a defendant for acceptance of responsibility. And that recognizes the idea that to go to trial takes a lot of resources from the court and the prosecution and so to save everybody that time and expense, if a defendant is willing to say, "Yes, I admit what I did, I'm wrong, I'm remorseful. I'd like to begin my rehabilitation and pay my debt to society," then they get a benefit for that.

I think we'll see a lot of those for people who might have been there but not done anything terribly bad. For those who were assaulting officers or damaging property and other kinds of things, those might be a little tougher because I think the plea deals might be numbers that people are a little less willing to take. And then at the most egregious levels when you have a conspiracy, maybe, some have been charged with conspiracy to obstruct an official proceeding, that being the congressional certification proceeding that was going on that day, you might see people getting a benefit in exchange for cooperation.

It may be that while you got me because I'm on video but I was working with five other guys and they were there and I can tell you who they were, what their names were, what they did, and agree even to testify against them. Or I'll give you my phone and a lot of other things that will help incriminate these other people and hold them accountable. And if somebody does that then they usually get what's known as a substantial assistance motion for reduction in sentence. It's still up to the judge to decide what the sentence will be when someone cooperates like that but the government agrees to make that cooperation known to the judge so that the judge can consider it in imposing a sentence. That has value to all the parties involved as well. I do think we'll continue to see more pleas but then ultimately I'm sure there will be some that do not plead guilty and we will need to have trials for those cases.

Also to shadow for prosecutors all over the country who are working on this, I know some of the prosecutors from my former office in the Eastern District of Michigan have raised their hands as have others around the country because there's such a huge number, more than 500 people charged. It's just too much for the DC office to handle in light of their other work and so these prosecutors from all over

the country have agreed to handle these cases. And because of the world of Zoom, they're able to do it remotely from their homes and communicate with lawyers by phone and email and have the hearings by Zoom. So kudos to all of the prosecutors nationwide who are working to resolve these cases.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Those were great points. And I want to stress the volume because I think that one of the biggest advantages to prosecutors is that it allows them, by taking these pleas and entering a plea agreement, to handle the volume. I mean, this is an unusual case with so many defendants. I'm going to take our last question which comes from @whymustyoujudge? And why must you judge, I ask? "Can those given pardons like Michael Flynn and Stone be indicted for the January insurrection if they are connected, if there's evidence?"

And the answer is, yes, that's a crime that happened after their pardon and so they can not be pardoned for a future crime. They were pardoned for crimes that they had already committed and anything that happened after that is fair game. Prosecutors may be asking, "What was Roger Stone doing on January 6th in his hotel room? He was seen with Proud Boys the day before. Why was he hold up? What did he know?" So there's plenty that may yet to come against some of the people who were pardoned by President Trump at the time.

And with that I want to thank you, our listeners, for being with us today on #SistersInLaw with Barb McQuade, Kimberly Atkins Stohr, and me Jill Wine-Banks. Joyce we'll be back with us next week. Don't forget to send in your questions by email to sistersinlaw@politico.com or tweet them for next week's show using #SistersInLaw. This week's sponsors are Girlfriend Collective, Function of Beauty, and ThirdLove. You can find their links in the show notes. Please support them as they really help make this show happen. To keep up with us every week, follow #SistersInLaw on Apple Podcasts or wherever you listen, and please give us a five-star review, we love to read your comments. See you next week with another episode, #SistersInLaw.

Barb McQuade:

We need a coda. I think Kim should sing us a summer song. Yeah, come on, Kim. You've got it, let's let's hear something from the summer.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Oh, my God, what song do I sing?

Barb McQuade:

What's your favorite summer song these days that you can sing?

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Oh, man.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Just don't ask me. I don't even sing happy birthday-

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Now I feel-

This transcript was exported on Aug 21, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Jill Wine-Banks:

I don't sing the Star-Spangled Banner, I mouth the words.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Well, you both you guys listen to Dancing in the Street, right?

Jill Wine-Banks:

Yeah.

Barb McQuade:

Oh, yeah. Let's go. That's a little Detroit anthem.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Sing it right, Detroit.

Barb McQuade:

Let's go.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

Detroit, show me how.

Barb McQuade:

A little shout to Detroit. Let's go.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

(singing).

Come on, y'all, sing on.

(singing).

Barb McQuade:

That's awesome. Excellent.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Absolutely awesome.

Barb McQuade:

Absolutely awesome, Kim. Well done.

Jill Wine-Banks:

So proud of you.

Kimberly Atkins Stohr:

This transcript was exported on Aug 21, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Hunks, have to go home to Detroit every month end.

Jill Wine-Banks:

Hope that made everyone dance, that's what I want to see.

Barb McQuade:

You're always welcome here.